PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
ARE OF POOR REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY

CERTAINES PARTIES DU DOCUMENT ORIGINAL
SONT DE PIÈTRE QUALITÉ DE REPRODUCTION

Volume

1

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	WABUSH	ENDROIT
DATE	September/septembre 29, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	1	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street,   Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario.   K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
B. WATTS	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Grenfell Hotel, Caribou Room, Wabush

DATE: September/septembre 29, 1986.

VOLUME: 1

OFFICIAL REPORTERS: Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.
PER: Eleanor Thomson
Francine Allard

INDEX

	PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman	1
Presentation by Major David McCabe	16

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Anne Ferreira	29
Ern Condon	33
Theresa Rowe	40
Anne Ferreira and Ern Condon	56
Anne Ferreira on behalf of Jim Prowse	83
Ern Condon	88
Joe Roberts	91

* * * * *

Sept. 20
ET:ET
pe 1-1

---Upon commencing at 7:15 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Can everybody hear me all right?

My name is David Barnes. I am the chairman of this panel which you see at the head table. It has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of existing and proposed military flying areas over certain parts of Labrador and Quebec.

Right at the start I would like to apologize to you all for the delay in starting this meeting. It happened because bad weather made us late getting out of Ottawa this morning, and we had to make some quite drastic changes to our flight plan in order to get here. We arrived less than an hour ago. Again, our apologies for that, and thank you for coming.

I would first like to introduce to you the other members of the panel.

Beginning on my right, at that end of the table, to your left, Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Paul is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec and with other native groups. He is a consultant is private practice established in Montreal, and has been involved in negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

Next to him, at my right elbow, is

Mr. William Jourdain who is a resident of Sept-Iles. Mr. Jourdain has been very active in Montagnais Indian band affairs, and has been administrative director of Les Galeries montagnaises, a shopping centre in Sept-Iles. He also worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years before his retirement.

At my left, Mr. Tom Northcott, who is a biologist having extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador. He is vice-president of Northland Associates Ltd., a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resources questions. Prior to that he was a research biologist in the wildlife division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

To his left is Mrs. Beatrice Watts who, I am sure, is well known to many of you. Mrs. Watts is Director of the Native Curriculum Centre of Labrador which develops text books in Native languages. She is a former Mayor of North West River, was a member of the National Status of Women Council in 1983-84, and has been involved in other ways in providing services to Native people. She is quite knowledgeable, therefore, about the interests and concerns of both Native people and settlers here in Labrador.

To her left is Mr. Don Stewart who is a resident of the Ottawa area where he operates a small farm. Prior to his retirement he was with the Canadian Forces, a Brigadier-General. His last position was Deputy Commander of NORAD, which included the responsibility for the training, equipping, maintaining and employment of U.S. and Canadian air defence forces in NORAD, and was for a time stationed at Goose Bay.

I apologize for the absence of the other member of our panel, Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill unfortunately ran into some problems making flight connections from his home in Makkovik to Wabush. He is the owner of a small business there and is quite knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Just a word about myself. I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office of the Government of Canada in Ottawa where I have been for approximately one year. I am the Director of the Atlantic Region for that office. Prior to that I was employed for about 11 years with the provincial government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the Environment Department.

I should introduce three other people who, together, form the Secretariat to the panel and who are here with us this evening.

First of all, the Executive Secretary to the panel, Mr. Carol Martin. Perhaps you would like to stand so that everybody can see who you are.

Assisting Mr. Martin are Mr. Michel Bourgon, at the back of the room, and Mr. Jim Clarke.

I would say right now that if anyone

who is here this evening would like to make a presentation to the panel this evening, and if you have not already done so we would like you to register by giving your name to Mr. Martin or one of the other two gentlemen. A convenient time to do that might be at a break which I am going to call after I provide some other introductory remarks, and after we near something about the project itself. At that time if you would care to register so we can see who is interested in speaking to us tonight, then we will see how much time we have and how much time we will be able to allocate to each speaker.

I think it is important for us all to understand why we are here. What is this process we are going through? Why is it happening here in Wabush tonight? What is the review all about?

It all began in 1974 when the Government of Canada decided it wanted to take a different approach from the one it had been using previously to that to examine proposed resource development projects, resource use projects, for which the Government of Canada was somehow responsible by way of it being on federal land or being supported by federal funds, etc.

In brief, what the government did was to establish a process called the Environmental Assessment and Review Process which is known in short as EARP. In works initially as a self-assessment system where the initiating department, as it is called, the federal department responsible for the project, examines the project internally and reaches a conclusion as to whether or not the project should be subjected to a public environmental review.

You can read all the details, if you wish, about the process itself in one of several publications that are available from our office. If you would like to see them, please mention it to one of the members of the Secretariat.

In particular, the review we are involved in at the present time, began about six months ago. It is expected to go on for perhaps another 18 months for a total period of time of about two years.

It began in February of this year when the Department of National Defence, which is the proponent in this project, wrote to the federal Minister of the Environment asking that a panel be appointed to conduct a public review. That referral, as we call it, described the project and, in brief, there are two components to the project. First of all there is the on-going low level flight training, which has been going on for at least five or six years, and which is proposed to be carried on and perhaps expanded somewhat by the addition of one or more additional NATO countries through bi-lateral agreements with the Government of Canada to conduct these exercises.

The second part of the project is a

proposal to establish a flight training centre at Goose Bay by NATO. It is important we understand that these two components are separate and do not necessarily depend on each other, and the Panel's terms of reference with regard to those two parts of the project are a little different.

Besides describing the project, as I say, the referral asked for a public environmental review and suggested the scope of that review. As such, it formed the basis for the development of the terms of reference, or the mandate of this panel. That, then, could be regarded as the first step of the process which, as I say, occurred in February of this year.

I am going to go on to describe five further steps which would be involved in the evolution and development of the process and carrying it through to the end.

The second step was the appointment of a panel and the publication of draft guidelines to be given to the proponent, the Department of National Defence.

The Panel was appointed by the Minister and given its terms of reference in July of 1986. Those terms of reference say that with regard to the existing low level flight training, the Panel is to examine that activity and the potential environmental impacts and is free to recommend to the government how any of those impacts might be lessened, in the

1-7

case of negative impacts, or enhanced,in the case of beneficial ones. But I want to make it clear that the Panel does not have a mandate to recommend the discontinuance of that activity.

With regard to the other component of the project, the proposal for the NATO Flight Training Centre in Goose Bay, in addition to recommending mitigating measures to enhance benefits or lessen negative impacts, the Panel in that case does have a mandate to recommend whether or not that proposal should be carried through.

Also part of this second step was the conducting of informal meetings to discuss the various issues which were seen to be emerging in connection with the proposal. These were organized by the staff of our office, and were held during the spring and summer of this year with various interested parties, particularly agencies of the federal, provincial and municipal governments, and with representatives of the Native people.

The result of that and the conclusion of the second step of the process was the publication of this document which we call Draft Guidelines. These are guidelines for the contents of a document called the Environmental Impact Statement which the Department of National Defence is expected to prepare and submit to the Panel. These guidelines were in August of this year and their purpose is to instruct the Department of National Defence on what subjects must be studied, examined and discussed in their Environmental Impact Statement.

The third step of the process in which we are involved at the present time consists, first of all, of holding public meetings to receive comments on these Draft Guidelines. When they were sent out they were covered by a Notice indicating exactly what they are and indicating that we wish to receive comment on the completeness or otherwise of these Guidelines. I should say that the content of the Guidelines is based on the outcome of the informal meetings that I mentioned our staff held with various interested parties, and also on the Panel's own opinion of what the issues are and how they should be examined. But before the Guidelines are made final we wish to receive comment on those from anyone who is interested.

Therefore,these public meetings to receive comments on the Draft Guidelines are being conducted during September and October, following which the Panel will meet and modify the Draft into its final form based on the information presented at these meetings. That will be done during November.

The Guidelines in the final form will then be presented to the Department of National Defence, probably during the month of December.

That concludes the third step.

Step four consists of the actual preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement by the Department of National Defence. That department will follow the Guidelines, will review existing information pertinent to those Guidelines, will conduct any new studies that may be necessary, and will write the report. At the end of that process it will present the Environmental Impact Study to the Panel, probably in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

The fifth step will consist of the examination of the Environmental Impact Statement and the holding of hearings on the project. First of all the Impact Statement will be made public for study during the period of the summer and fall of 1987. At the same time it will be examined by the Panel and by the Government during the same period. If necessary at that time the Panel may request the Department of National Defence to present additional information if something is seen to be missing in the content of the Impact Statement based on the Guidelines as the criterion.

Once the Panel is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is that it meets the requirements of the Guidelines, the Panel will then announce public hearings to discuss the project. The most likely time for those hearings, as we foresee it now, is the fall of 1987.

Finally then, step number six. There will be a report made by the Panel to both the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National

Defence of the Government of Canada. That report will contain a discussion of the project, the expected impacts and possible remedies. It will contain recommendations on whether the NATO Training Centre should be established at Goose Bay and, if it were to be approved, how it should be built and operated.

It will also contain recommendations on how to conduct the on-going low level flight training that I mentioned earlier. That report is to be presented to the Ministers of the Environment and of National Defence in late 1987 or early 1988.

That, in a sort of capsule form, is an outline of this whole process in which we are involved at the present time.

I wonder, at this time, if there are any questions that anyone would like to put concerning the process and our reason for being here.

If not then, I should mention that if anyone feels they would like ...

No, you can speak to the Secretary about that.

If anyone wishes to say something to the Panel and they are perhaps hesitant about speaking up in public, then we would be quite happy to speak to you individually during one of the breaks or after the meeting. I would caution that really, if we are to consider some information that you would like to present to us, we really would need to have it

1-11

in writing so it can go on the public record. If is is not on the record either through being spoken here and going into the transcript of the meeting, or presented to us in writing, then it can not really be put on the record as an item the Panel is taking into consideration.

Do we have a question at the back? No, we do not. I wonder, if you have a question, could you come up to one of the microphones please.

ERN CONDON: My name is Ern Condon. I will be giving my name to be part of a presentation later on. But just for clarification in terms of what you have just said, one thing, right from the beginning is my understanding that the whole process, as I understand it, the process under which you work, was under review, or is supposedly to be under review of recent times. I am just wondering what the result of that review, if it did occur, was? The environmental assessment review process, as I understand it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not quite sure I know what you mean by the process being under review. Could you clarify that?

ERN CONDON: My understanding was that there were some bugs that needed to be worked out, or that there were some difficulties with regard to the process as such. That was an understanding that I had. I am wondering what the results of that review were if it did happen. Or maybe it did not happen, I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not believe I am aware of any specific examination of the process. The whole process has been evolving, and we hope improving over the 12 years since it was established. Each review is a little different than the one that went before it. We hope we are getting better at it all the time.

I do not suppose any environmental assessment process, federal or provincial, can be regarded as perfect, but beyond that I am not sure I know ...

ERN CONDON: In regard to the outline, I have two questions. They would both, to some degree, reflect what we are going to say later. One, you mention criteria regarding whether the project needs to be given a public review. From the beginning there was discussion as to whether this project needed to be given a review, and obviously it was a decision that it did need to be given a review. Could you give me a summary of what the reasons and the concerns were regarding the need to have the review in the first place.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I would not be able to do that. That self-assessment process was conducted within the Department of National Defence and our office did not become involved until after that decision had been made and that Department had written to the Minister of the Environment and asked for the review. We were not privy to the internal decision-making process that led to that decision.

ERN CONDON: The second and final question would be in relation to your reference to the fact that the Panel does not have a mandate to recommend discontinuance of low level flying. I am wondering on what ground that was based and where the directive would come from?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is part of the mandate of the Panel, the terms of reference, which we accept as a given when we were appointed as a Panel. The terms of reference are developed as a matter of consultation between the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of the initiating department which, in this case is the Department of National Defence. It is up to those two ministers exactly what goes into the terms of reference that are given to the Panel. Beyond that I would not be able to make a comment.

ERN CONDON: So the Panel has no authority to question the mandate it has been given. In other words if you were given as a committee, as a panel and as a process, as informed experts in the area, that you felt was basically, fundamentally wrong, do you have a right to reject it, or do you have a right to make recommendations, or do you just have to take it, per se, and put it forward and let other people object to it?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe in the history of the process there was one occasion in the past where the Panel decided that it wanted to ask the Minister of the Environment to review its mandate and to make some change in it. That happened once in all of the projects that have been subjected to review. I suppose, with that precendent, the same sort of thing could happen again if the Panel were convinced that it wanted to do that.

ERN CONDON: But in this instance you were not?

THE CHAIRMAN: In this instance, we have not been asked to yet.

ERN CONDON: Okay. So that is still an open question. Because there were two other exclusions from there, as I am sure you are aware, and everybody else is, and they are the land claims settlement and also the Canadian Defence Policy. I seem to infer from your Guidelines that you were more or less leaving these things open to some degree and it surprised me that the low level flying would be indicated right from the beginning as being recommended, that the mandate does not allow -- assuming that all the criteria and all the investigation analysis comes up with a recommendation that the low level flying is detrimental to the caribou and to all the other things -- it would surprise me that this process would not have it in its mandate

.-15

to make that statement that in our opinion this infringement upon the environmental area in question has a negative effect, and should be discontinued.

THE CHAIRMAN: The two items that are specifically excluded from the responsibility of the Panel are policy items. First of all the policy of the Government of Canada in providing for the defence of the country, and the policy of the Government in dealing with the Native people on land claims negotiations.

The Guidelines indicate, as one issue, the consideration of potential effects on the outcome of land claims negotiations. It states very carefully that the land claims policy of the Government is not to be examined, so we have not departed from our mandate as we see it. That is the way the Panel feels at the present time.

ERN CONDON: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At this time I would like to introduce another person here in the room, and it is Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence. Perhaps you would like to stand and identify yourself.

It is customary in these meetings that the Panel holds in public to invite along a representative of the proponent department for the purpose of providing information on the project. Logically we feel that the proponent knows the project best, and the Panel wants to make sure that members of the public and the Panel have the best possible information on exactly what the project it. Therefore, it is customary to invite a person along to make a brief presentation at the beginning of each meeting in a different community to outline the project, and then to respond to any questions which may be coming from the audience.

At this time, Major McCabe would you like to make your presentation please.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I would first like to thank you for attending this hearing, and for giving me, as a representative of the project proponent, the Department of National Defence, an opportunity to briefly explain the proposals which are to be examined during the course of the study.

I would like to provide a very brief background to explain developments which led to these proposals.

Goose Bay Airport has been associated with a variety of military flying activities since its construction in 1941 at which time it supported aircraft transiting to Europe during the hostilities of World War II. Post-war years saw many fluctuating periods of activity at Goose Bay. During the relatively quiet years of the 1970's, Vulcan bombers of the Royal Air Force could be seen from time to time conducting low level flying training in the interior. As well, the United States Air Force maintained facilities to support transport aircraft staging through to resupply American bases in Europe.

In 1980 the Royal Air Force expanded its operations somewhat to include other types of more modern aircraft such as the F-4 Phantom, Jaguar, Buccaneer and Harrier. As well, the German Air Force, in its efforts to achieve better low level training for its air crew, proposed a limited flying program at Goose Bay with F-4 Phantoms.

Due to this increase in low level flying activity at that time and in response to public concerns over possible detrimental effects which might result, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation of the proposed increased activity. This evaluation was limited to a study of existing data on such activity and was not intended to be a in-depth on-site study by experts on all aspects of environmental and socio-economic issues.

The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment appeared to be negligible. But as existing data on caribou were inconclusive, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance of the animals be established. In order to coordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Coordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian

Forces personnel, the MCC as we call it, handles all local military flight plans and advises air crew on a daily basis of local restructions such as caribou concentrations, and active fishing or hunting camps when these are known.

The northern training area has been sub-divided into three parts in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migration and calving areas as required.

As well, known occupied camps are marked with a five nautical mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low level aircraft.

In a further effort to better handle allied military flying activity at Goose Bay, Canada this year negotiated a multi-national Memorandum of Understanding with each of the allied users. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which existed between each allied user and several federal departments. Under the current agreement, the Canadian Forces are the sole agent for the control of allied military flying a Goose Bay. The agreement provides a definition of common use facilities which are equally shared by all parties in their costing, and dedicated use facilities such as barracks and hangars which are funded entirely by the specific user.

As well, each user is limited in the number of aircraft and personnel which can be in Goose Bay at any one time. Any other nations wishing

2-1
ET:ET
Sept.29

to train at Goose Bay must become party to this Memorandum of Understanding. Currently there are four signators to the agreement, these being the Air Forces of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level tactical flying activity.

The Canadian Forces support the long range radar and approach control radar facilities, and provides transient servicing to itinerant aircraft. As well, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay.

The Americans continue to primarily support transient transport aircraft.

The Royal Air Force, although permitted by the agreement up to a maximum of 25 aircraft, currently maintains 9 Tornado fighter bombers during the flying season which typically runs from March to the end of October.

The German Air Force is somewhat closer to its maximum limit of 25 aircraft, rotating between Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets.

Current operations consist primarily of tactical missions of between two to four aircraft flying at a variety of altitudes down as low as 100 feet above ground in designated areas for usually one to one and one-half hours per mission.

Each mission usually entails navigation

training, tactical manoeuvering and, on occasion, delivery of practice weapons on a practice target range. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminant devices, which sometimes contain a small smoke charge to indicate impact point.

Currently there is only one target range approved for use. It is in the southern low level training area approximately 65 nautical miles from Goose Bay. It is eight nautical miles in diameter and is located in an open burned out area. The area is clearly marked with signed printed in English, French and two Native languages.

A proposed second practice target area is being examined in the northern training area, but it has not received final approval at that stage. Local interest groups are being consulted on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability by all concerned.

The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding. In conjunction with this proposed increase, some development of the southern practice target range is taking place. This includes development of a simulated airfield complex and supporting facilities such as surface to air missile sites and operation centres. These are constructed of very basic materials such as logs and plywood, and are meant to be replaceable as required. There is no

2-3

intention at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Flying training by the current users will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying and may include some limited night and poor weather flying. These two activities are designed to train air crews in the use of the terrain-following radar equipment currently in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by current users, other nations have recently shown some interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing training facilities in Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present the Dutch hope to commence a half season training program flying F-16 fighter aircraft during the summer of 1987. Initially 10 to 12 aircraft would involved, and about 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed by the two governments at this time.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity.

Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give you a brief background of the NATO Training

9

2-4

Centre project. Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO Air Forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe, specifically Germany. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity, and indeed some types of training are almost impossible for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls, and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well-trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated tactical fighter weapons training centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked to submit their training requirements and, based on these statistics, a specially appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility to cater to all the training requirements. As the working group was instructed that cost was not to be a constraint in its planning, a huge full-scope centre was proposed.

The scope of the centre was detailed in a Phase I report submitted to NATO in 1983. Two countries have offered potential sites for the centre: Goose Bay in Canada and Conia Air Base in Turkey. Site surveys were conducted of each site last year, and the initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group to its NATO masters. NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that

2-5 selection, negotiations and detailed planning would commence with the host country taking into account up-dated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design and implementation of the centre.

The planning phase is due to be completed by December, 1988. During this phase is an insurmountable obstacle should be encountered, the alternate site would then be considered.

The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays. The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, once again in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year. In other words, for 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties by transport-type aircraft as they would go about changing over personnel and equipment and resupplying the detachment.

Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1300 ground personnel transiting through the airport every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1700. As these support personnel would be on two or three year postings, many of them could be expected to bring their families thus further increasing the population by approximately 1000 to 1500 people.

2 -6

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer products distributors' stores would be required.

Included in the initial construction would be the upgrading of existing airfield facilities such as a parallel runway, and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system.

A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating an extension of the current shipping season or expansion of the trans-Labrador highway system.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum scope of activity. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say that as currently envisioned, aircraft would partake in several training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be: low leval tactical navigation and reconnaissance similar to the kind of activity that goes on right now; air combat training, usually at medium to high altitudes, that would involve some supersonic flight; electronic warfare training at all altitudes using on-board electronic systems and ground based systems simulating enemy

2-7 facility.

Practice weapons delivery, ideally in the scope as laid out in the Phase I report, they would need about four of these ranges similar to the one that exists at the present time.

Live weapons delivery, again an optimum of three ranges.

Tactical air support of maritime operations, which would involve anti-shipping activities, and involved in that would be the establishment of a sea range. There has been some reference to that. All that entails is a target being towed by a ship which would aircraft would fire inert practice weapons at.

And flag-type exercises, as they are known, involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles. Several of these requirements are desirable only -- that is, they are not mandatory -- recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities from being carried out. This includes the sea range which I mentioned and also an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath an air-to-air gunnery range would have to be sterile or unpopulated, it would probably have to be over the ocean.

Since the initial statement of requirements for live weapons ranges, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. As this is all

-8

done electronically, there are obvious advantages to such a system such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reduction. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project and proportionately affected by the scope of the actual project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full-scope optimum facility was examined as defined in the Phase I Report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative and any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Suffice it to say that there would be significant benefits to be gained if a full scope centre is established.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: the construction, or initial implementation phase, and the operational phase. Obviously the majority of local employment opportunities would occur during the construction phase.

-9 The subsequent operational phase would consist of more specialized long-term jobs directly related to the training centre, but would positively affect spinn-off businesses in the area.

Of possible interest to communities other than Goose Bay-Happy Valley and its immediate neighbours is the requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency or bad weather diversion. Goose Bay, being quite isolated, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the training scenario of the NATO training centre might require forward operating locations to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role. Both of these alternate field roles would require some upgrading of local facilities such as runway extensions, refuelling capabilities and accommodation on a limited scale.

Potential locations being considered by the NATO working group are Schefferville, Wabush and Churchill Falls. From these locations, incidentally, you may realize that the working group has centered its survey on Goose Bay's potential on the northern training area as it exists today.

The southern area would still likely be low level flying, such as is currently conducted.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals, particularly with reference to the NATO training centre, are based on optimum

2-10 facilities. All nations today are undergoing economic cut-backs and belt tightening exercises, and military programs are not exempt. I can safely say, however, that development in Labrador would appear to have a positive future in proposed military training activities, subject, of course, to the recommendations of this Panel.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and for the opportunity to address the interested public here in Wabush.

I would be happy to answer any questions pertaining to my presentation, if that if okay with you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

Yes, I imagine that presentation may stimulate a few questions.

First of all, I would like to ask if any member of the Panel would like to direct a question to you.

All right then. If not, then if anybody in the audience would like to put a question to Major McCabe, I would like you to first of all raise you hand so I can recognize you, then come up to this table and sit at one of the other microphones and state your name, the name of the organization, if you are representing an organization, and before you start to speak, press the red button on the base of the microphone to turn on the red light if it has not already been turned on for you.

I believe I saw a hand down there. Yes, would you like to come up.

ANNE FERREIRA: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. My name is Anne Ferreira. I am here to speak on behalf of a group, but the couple of questions I have are spontaneous, so I would like to speak as an individual, please.

I am wondering -- it seems like a very naive question -- but, first of all thank you for all the information received. It was appreciated.

I am still not quite sure why NATO feels that it needs the TFWTC. It seems like quite a step-up in operations from what it has at the moment, at least in Goose Bay. I am really not aware of all the other world-wide operations it has, so I am not sure why it needs the TFWTC, if that is a fair question to pose to you?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Obviously I cannot speak for NATO decisions, but I know a little about what is behind it.

First of all I might mention that some people get confused with the current operations which we tend to refer to as allied training activities, or allied users, and the NATO project. This is a confusion stemming from the fact that the allied users are members of NATO, but they are not here in Goose Bay under any kind of NATO program. They have formerly been referred to as bi-lateral agreements. The countries are here conducting their own training

2-12

programs.

With reference as to why NATO is looking for an area, as simply as possible I have to go back to the fact that facilities have always been and are very scarce in Europe, and are really getting smaller and fewer in their availability. The technology of aircraft today, of tactics that the NATO air forces utilize, require types of training which are really not available, and of course the nations are suffering from that, if you like. The air crews are not getting the proper training to meet their commitments. Because of those restrictions, the shortfalls in the annual training, NATO is trying to find a place which will have minimum restrictions where they can combine together and mutually benefit from the training environment. I hope that is sufficient.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you. In other words, NATO feels that it just does not have adequate training at the moment.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: That is correct. There have been shortfalls for some years, and there is certainly no solution in sight in continental Europe.

Initially when this project started they were looking to establish a location in Europe but there was a bit of a paradox because that is where all the lack of facilities exist. That is why they extended the project to look at potential sites offshore.

ANNE FERREIRA: May I ask another

2-13

question, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMEN; Yes, certainly. Go right ahead.

ANNE FERREIRA: I have a question about the live ranges. Is that what they are called? I hope I have the right terminology. You mentioned, of course, they would be remote, and you are not sure whether they would in fact be needed. But if so, they would not be fenced off, obviously, because it would be a huge area. How do you, in fact, make sure that no one ever goes in them when they are not supposed to? I am not quite sure in my mind how that would be done. What sort of measures do you take to warn people off of the area?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: First of all, to say that it is a huge area is not necessary so. The area, for example, that currently exists for the practice weapons range is eight nautical miles in diameter in the existing low level training area of approximately 32,000 square miles. It is a very small area. A live weapons range, because of the nature of the ordinance, would as well be very small.

We have similar ranges in various parts of Canada. They are, in some cases, fenced off particularly if there are population centres near by. They are fenced off and obviously sign-posted as well.

There are other measures that can be taken. They can put cut lines around them, and things like that. Obviously the more remote we get,

2-14

the further into the interior, the better it is as far as the population goes. But, once again, the criteria that existed years ago in establishing these things has long since changed, and it is of paramount importance that the location of these ranges be suitable to all people.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you. I believe you said that under optimal conditions there would be about 200 sorties daily. I just wanted to clarify what sort of increase that would be from the present number of sorties. I thought I heard you say three to four a day. Is that too low for the present level of low level flying sorties per day?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Yes, it is indeed. I mentioned the reference of two to four was the number of aircraft in each mission.

Normally the aircraft that are typically there today in Goose Bay; each aircraft will turn around two times, possibly three times, depending on weather, etc., and the training requirements. Therefore it is possible with two nations there, as we have right now, on a good day in the summer with long daylight hours, it is possible to get up to 80 or 100 sorties I would think. Once again, that is on a very good day.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else in the audience care to ask a question?

Would you kindly come up to the front

2-15 and identify yourself, please.

ERN CONDON: Thank you. My name is Ern Condon. I have a question or two, if I may.

I have a number of concerns. I sat here in September of 1985 and listened to a presentation on what was involved in this whole military operation. I am surprised to some degree, and pleased to hear a specific outline of what a technical weapons fighter training centre includes, because up until now, at least to my knowledge, we have not seen it. But in relation to it I will react to it now, based on hearing it.

I think the Major mentioned, right at the beginning, that this was a mere proposal. There was almost an inference there that this is a mere proposal and somehow or other it happened by accident to catch the attention of the media, and the attention of the people.

I sat in a room where I heard this thing being put forward as being the Labrador salvation for the future. I do not think it was coincidental or accidental that it was picked up.

I have also spent the last year or so listening to our government putting out land, bringing over people, wining and dining them, flying them in and out of Labrador like they are going out of style. Therefore I think it is more than just an incidental pick-up that this Tactical Weapons Fighter Training Centre was viewed with come excitement in Labrador.

2-15 I would almost be bold enough to suggest that it is being dangled like a carrot that we should all jump at because we are starving and unemployed. This is just a general observation.

I heard, and I asked the question the last time,in September, regarding the live ranges and the potential for escalation. It surprises me that, and the Major mentioned, that the projections are based on 1981 estimates. It was proposed in 1983 and here we are in 1986, and we heard the story in 1985 but we did not hear anything about sea ranges; we did not hear anything about the specifics of this whole operation. We have found out now that all of this was devised and brought up in 1981. It concerns me that this kind of information somehow or other has not been put out to the public at this stage in the game. It will come out later on in our brief. That was one of the things we saw as a gap. No one seems to know exactly what this Technical Weapons Fighter Training Centre is per se, and we were trying to find it out through the grapevine.

Now I almost get the inference that it is a pie in the sky false hope that we have somehow or other accidentally gotten excited about, and it might never come anyway. These are just observations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder, Mr. Condon, if you have a question to ask?

ERN CONDON: My question is why the lack of information, why the lack of awareness, why the lack of effort to put this thing forward in the first place? And why is our government, after designating hundreds of thousands of square kilometers of Labrador for this assumed optimal thing that might never come?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I can give some answer there. I would like to clarify: you mentioned that the requirement for live weapons ranges etc. was available in 1981. That is not correct. It was in 1981 that this project started. It took until 1983 for the scoping, if you like, the definition of the proposed centre to be completed. It was presented at that time. Canada did not offer Goose Bay until July of 1984. The surveys were not done in Goose Bay until October of last year.

Yes, time has passed. One must understand that these things do not happen over-night. Unfortunately they do not happen nearly as fast as we would like them to, particularly the preliminary things.

The lack of information has always been a problem, and it ties in with your comments on the pie in the sky thing. Any time there is a major project, particularly in an area that would welcome some kind of a big venture coming in, there is always the danger of people jumping to conclusions. The Department of National Defence has been very cautious about this proposal. As far as providing information, we cannot over-emphasize the fact that it is a proposal. Over the next two years, when they sit down and design

2-17

this centre on the ground for the selected site, all sorts of things may change due to restrictions, or whatever. We try and give as much information as we have available at the time, and that is what we are trying to do. That is our purpose in being here. We do not want to be pinned down by making absolute statements. We merely want to give the public an idea of what is being considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any further questions, Mr. Condon?

ERN CONDON: If I may?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, all right.

ERN CONDON: In relation to that point, and before I go on, assuming there was reference that we have other tactical fighter weapons training centre elsewhere. Obviously if you are using a lot of weapons elsewhere, we could probably anticipate they would be used here.

Just a couple of other questions. One, you made a comment with regard to the initial low level study that there was an in-house departmental study done regarding the initial low level flying -- I am not sure whether I am posing the question to the Panel or to the Major in terms of what the feeling was with regard to that -- I was surprised to hear that. Because when we heard at the last meeting that that study was, to my mind, purported to be a legitimate, valid study that clearly indicated that there was negligible effect to low level flying

-18 and that everything was quite fine with the situation as it is now. I am finding that it was a very limited study and that the only data studied was existing at the time. Existing data was reviewed. Therefore, I have concern about that.

The other aspect I am concerned about is that it said in the study, about the caribou, that there was some inconclusive evidence, that there were avoidance mechanisms being brought in. My comment on that is that I thought there were some caribou calving herds that were abandoned during the process,that apparently were abandoned, as I understood it, as a result of being over-flown and wanting to move. I might be wrong on that, but I am just throwing the question out for reaction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, do you feel like trying to respond to that question, please.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I would just like to say that that is exactly the purpose of this whole review process. It is to examine if there has been any detrimental effects to any of the animal populations in the existing training areas, and indeed if there is any potential damage.

Suggestions that calving grounds have been abandoned in the past due to military overflights are, to my mind, conjecture. They are not substantiated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there anything else, Mr. Condon?

-19 ERN CONDON: If you will ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, one more question, perhaps.

ERN CONDON: One more. Okay.

There was mention, and I will use your words, cost saving regarding the ordinance system that would need to be put in place if you used the ocean area for gunnery ranges, or whatever, sterile or unpopulated areas, and so on. My question would be: what would the cost saving venture be to our government if the whole thing was scrapped?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I suppose that is rather a rhetorical question, but I will make just a brief comment. Our government is only a very small part of it. I must remind people that it is a NATO project, that particular project. Funding comes from all the participating nations. Canada would be one of possibly 16 or so nations that would be involved. As far as scrapping the whole project, that is not really what I am here to talk about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

ERN CONDON: Thank you very much, Major. I apologize for forgetting your rank.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I appreciate the promotion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Condon. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to put a question to Major McCabe concerning the nature of the project? I see not.

-1
ET:ET
Sept.29

Very well then, at this time I would like to call a 15 minute break in the meeting. There is coffee available outside, and during this break I will ask you please to identify yourself to Mr. Jim Clarke in the back row -- he has his hand up -- saying that you would like to make a presentation to the Panel and giving him all the particulars that he needs concerning your identity and affiliation with whatever organization it may be.

We will come back again in 15 minutes. Thank you very much.

---Short break.

---Upon resuming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin the meeting again. If you would all be seated. Thank you.

During the break, four people have some forward to indicate that they would like to make a presentation to the Panel this evening.

In the case of one of the parties we, in fact, received a letter last week asking if the organization could speak this evening. The group is the Labrador Inuit Association being represented here this evening by their legal counsel, Ms Theresa Rowe. I might mention that, as acknowledged in their letter, the presentation this evening is not directly pertinent to the purpose of these meetings as I stated to you earlier this evening. However, in the interest of being fair to all interested parties, and considering that the subject of the presentation is related to the conduct of the review, we have decided to agree to their request, and agree also to the request that they be placed first on the program.

Considering that we have four potential speakers, I think it would be reasonable to ask each speaker to limit the time of his or her presentation to a maximum of 20 minutes. Following this, in each case, we could invite questions first from the Panel and then from the audience, as appropriate.

Ms Rowe, if you are ready, would you kindly come up to the front and sit at the table please.

---SUBMISSION BY THERESA ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Panel.

As was previously stated, my name is Theresa Rowe. I am a partner in the law firm of Haysom and Rowe located at Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia. Our firm has been retained to represent the Labrador Inuit Association. The Association has asked us to present a statement today. But, before I begin I would like to clarify the purpose of my attendance here tonight.

Firstly, my appearance on behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association is conditional. It is made for the sole purpose of raising certain preliminary matters and is not in any way to be taken as

Sub., Rowe

-3

an indication that LIA consents to the Panel or its process, nor is it to be construed as an indication that LIA is participating in the review.

Secondly, my mandate is limited. The only issue that I am authorized to discuss this evening is that of reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of LIA as a result of the composition of the Panel. I am only authorized to raise specific issues and to make specific statements in this regard. I am not authorized to represent or to present LIA's views on the Draft Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement on the project.

Should any matters arise outside of my mandate, I will have to withdraw and seek further instructions from our client.

So, to begin: LIA is reasonably apprehensive of bias in the Environmental Assessment Panel review of military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec as a result of the composition of the Panel, and specifically as a result of the participation of Dr. Paul Wilkinson on the Panel. I must stress that LIA's objection is based on reasonable apprehension of bias, and in no way is there an allegation of any pecuniary conflict of interest.

The review being conducted here today by the Panel is governed by the provisions of the Environmental Assessment and Review Process Guideline Order SOR/84-467. Section 22 of that Order

,-4

provides that the members of the Panel shall be unbiased and free of any potential conflict of interest relative to the proposal under review. It is significant to note that these words are repeated in the introductory section of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines which are the subject of consideration here this evening.

The requirement for freedom of bias contained in this Order is no doubt based on the well settled principle that not only must justice be done, but it must also manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done.

It is LIA's position that it is not necessary to demonstrate that the decision-maker is actually biased but merely that there is reasonable apprehension of bias in order to affect the validity of the proceedings.

The test we suggest which should be used to determine if there exists a reasonable apprehension of bias is as follows: Are there circumstances from which from which a reasonable man would think it likely or probable that the decision-maker would favour one side unfairly at the expense of another. It is not necessary to inquire whether he would, in fact, favour one side unfairly. Suffice it that reasonable people might think he would.

The following is an outline of the facts only which have led to LIA's apprehension of bias. LIA commenced negotiations with the Government of

Quebec and the Government of Canada to gain recognition of Labrador Inuit rights in Quebec in April of 1984. Early in those negotiations it became clear that the Native people of Quebec, who secured rights under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement, would have to consent to the kind of settlement desired by LIA because the LIA settlement may affect the rights and interests of the Native people of Quebec under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement.

The Naskapi Bank of Quebec is a party to the Northeastern Quebec Agreement, and also enjoys certain rights under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

The first meeting between LIA and the Naskapi of Quebec took place in Schefferville, Quebec on the 31st of July and the 1st of August, 1984. At that meeting the Naskapi of Quebec were represented by Dr. Paul Wilkinson, amongst others. Since that date there have been more than a dozen meetings relating to the negotiation of the Labrador Inuit claim in Quebec, and Dr. Paul Wilkinson has represented the Naskapi of Quebec as a negotiator at all but a few of those meetings.

As a result of LIA's pursuit of Labrador Inuit interests in Quebec, representatives of the Association have attended meetings of the Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Co-ordinating Committee, established pursuant to the provisions of Section 24 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. LIA representatives attended meetings of the committee as observers. The committee is concerned with management of wildlife in the territory covered by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement. The Native people of Quebec are represented on the committee. Specifically, the Naskapi of Quebec are entitled to appoint two representatives to the committee. Dr. Paul Wilkinson represents the Naskapi of Quebec as a voting member of the co-ordinating committee. For example, as a representative of the Naskapi of Quebec, he attended and participated in the meeting of the co-ordinating committee held in Kuujjuak, Quebec on September 10 and 11 of this year.

The Naskapi of Quebec have unsettled land claims in Labrador which they are now attempting to have resolved.

The meeting was held between LIA and the Naskapi of Quebec to discuss Naskapi claims in Labrador, and Labrador Inuit claims in Quebec on the 18th and 19th of September of this year in Goose Bay. Dr. Paul Wilkinson was one of the negotiators representing the Naskapi of Quebec at that meeting.

It is these circumstances which have led LIA to perceive Dr. Wilkinson as an active, and I might add, effective advocate of Naskapi rights and interests. It is these circumstances that LIA reasonably believes may lead to a bias in the decision making recommendations of this Panel.

LIA wishes to participate in this review but only if it is satisfied that the review process is one that LIA can respect; one that does not prejudice Labrador Inuit interests.

LIA has concerns about the terms of reference, and also believes that it has reasonable grounds to apprehend bias on the part of the Panel as presently constituted. LIA's concerns about the terms of reference are now being dealt with in a different form, and we hope will be resolved.

The association's concern about possible bias must be dealt with here at the first instance. LIA's concern is that the potential for bias has not been recognized or accepted by anyone on the Panel, and that LIA has not received assurances in response to its concerns that all Panel members, including Dr. Wilkinson, are able to act in good faith, fairly and with open and objective minds. If this Panel, and specifically Dr. Wilkinson, is able to assure LIA that it recognizes the close and on-going relationship between Dr. Wilkinson and the Naskapi of Quebec, and if the Panel, and particularly Dr. Wilkinson, is able to assure LIA that they can and will act in good faith, fairly and objectively, notwithstanding those close and on-going ties, LIA's apprehension of bias will be put to rest.

If the assurances that LIA seeks cannot

be given, LIA will have to decide whether it should participate in this review process, or whether it should seek other avenues for the protection of the rights and interests of its members in relation to this project.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, if the Panel would like time to consider this statement and the Panel's response, I have been instructed by LIA that they are prepared to wait a reasonable time to receive your response. If the Association is to participate in this review and do any service to this process and its membership, it must begin its preparations immediately. Under these circumstances, a reasonable time for response, we would suggest, should be the end of this week. We would ask you to make any reasonable response to William Anderson, the President of the Association. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Ms Rowe.

I would like to say one thing with regard to the Panel as a whole in response to your statement. That is that it is standard practice to request each candidate for appointment to any panel in our process to provide a certificate stating that he or she is not aware of any potential conflict of interest being involved in his or her participation on the panel prior to actually being appointed. In the case of this panel, as with all of the others, those certificates were provided to the Minister by each member of the Panel. I think that is all I would like to say about the Panel as a whole. I would like to ask Dr. Wilkinson if he would care to say anything at this time, or would he prefer to leave matters for a later response as requested by LIA?

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Thank you.

If I could begin on a light note, I would have to conclude from what you had said that the ideal candidate, as far as LIA is concerned, on such a panel might be a person who had never been in the north, never had any contacts with Native people or of the Native people. My assumption has always been that having knowledge of the north and the various Native and non-Native peoples is an asset rather than a disadvantage. That, however, is said somewhat lightly.

To follow up on what the Chairman said, I was obviously asked before I joined the Panel to sign a statement saying that I was without conflict of interest or without bias. I thought seriously before doing this, and I came to the conclusion that there was only one area where I could foresee a possibility of bias. That, in fact, was in my representation of the Naskapis at the Co-ordinating Committee, which you mentioned, when that Committee discusses matters related to low level flying.

In reporting on the meeting in Kuujjuak, you did in fact make two errors. First of all, I did

3-10

not attend that meeting as a voting member; I was there as an advisor to the Naskapis. But perhaps more important, and I think this has been reported to you, I did specifically withdraw from the meeting for all discussion of any issues related to the mandate of this Panel.

Now this said, I think for the moment I can do only two things. One is to assure you that, in my opinion, I am not in a position of bias. I think the fact that I have broad experience and broad knowledge is an asset and a protection against bias. I would say if my knowledge was narrow and limited, limited only to the Naskapis, there is then a real potential for bias, bias that arises from ignorance. As it is, in the course of my career in northern Quebec, I have worked for Hydro Quebec, James Bay Energy Corporation, James Bay Development Corporation, Quebec Transport, Quebec Housing Corporation, the Cree Regional Authority, the Grand Council of the Crees, the Kativik Regional Government. Through all of this I have been in contact with other Native groups, the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association of Labrador, the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais and other groups. I think the overall result of this is to minimize the chance that I will be biased precisely because I have a broad view of the groups concerned, of their interests, of the possible impacts of the activities that we are studying on those groups. I am not parochial in terms of the northern Quebec.

3-11

My knowledge if broad and general rather than detailed.

You asked for an assurance from myself in particular that I would not act with bias. I have a friend who says it is a mean man who will not promise. Of course I will give you an assurance that I will not act with bias. I have spent a career of 20 years in the north involved in the kind of work where, had it been perceived that I were a person who would act with bias, particularly with the kind of malicious bias that you seem to have in mind, I can only tell you that if that were the case, I would not have survived in the kind of work I do in the areas I do as long as I have.

I do not think my word to you is your protection. I think your protection is several other things. First of all, I am one member of a panel of seven persons. To some extent this is a panel that controls itself. If, at any time, any one of us feels that one or more of the other members are somehow representing a biased viewpoint, a minority group, or whatever, rather than the principles of the review and the interests are at stake, then there are six other people who could turn around and say: Hey, you, act with fairness. You said you would do so. Do so. That is your protection. Your first and your best protection are these people sitting on my left.

Your second protection rises from the fact that everything this Panel does is public. If I

3-12

am to exert bias, I have to do it in a public way. Therefore, not only will I be subject to my colleagues picking up on it, I will be subject to your organization, any other organization, the general public, whoever, being able to sit down, analyze transcripts of what I have said, obtain copies of papers 1 might wish to put in, or anything else. And that, I think, gives you two protections against bias on my part, of a kind that you very rarely find in any process at all.

Therefore, I would say that rather than agonize over the possibility that there might be bias, I would point out, and I do so half-seriously and half-jokingly, that the organization to which your Council is also an organization that has particular links, financial and other, with the federal government.

I could sit here and I could devise a scenario whereby the Labrador Inuit Association, because of its dependancy on the federal government for funds, because of its desire, maybe, to influence federal policies, it conceivably could be biased. I could say maybe the Inuit of Labrador should be represented by another group, another group that does not get federal funds, another group that does not have links with the federal government and with other Native parties as a result of land claims. Because all things I could say, they could bias you. But I am not saying it, and I think it is ridiculous.

3-13

I will do what I would advise you to do: Let's watch what happens. The moment you perceive bias on my part, or the moment that anyone else perceives bias on my part or the part of anyone else, then I invite you to shout and to shout loud about it. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Wilkinson.

Ms Rowe, I will give you an opportunity to respond briefly,if you wish,in just a moment.

First of all I would like to say that since each of us has provided the certification in advance to the Minister before being appointed to the Panel, that in the absence of any specific reason coming forth from the LIA, I do not think that any of the rest of us on the Panel would plan to undertake to give anything over and above that.

With regard to Dr. Wilkinson, and having heard what he has just said, do you still want something further in connection with his membership on the Panel? If so, what form would you like to see that take, for example, if we were to consider that.

THERESA ROWE: I would like to make two comments with respect to Dr. Wilkinson's comments.

LIA's understanding was that your declaration related directly to contractual or pecuniary interests with the Naskapi Band.

Also, our allegations are not of bias, but rather of apprehension of bias. We are not accusing you of anything. The declaration did not

-14 address that specific point. That we have apprehension of bias does not go towards contractual or pecuniary bias or conflict of interest.

Secondly, we appreciate that all the members here have varying experiences and have gained their expertise through their experiences. But there is a subtle different here: Dr. Wilkinson acts as a negotiator, and presently does so now for the Naskapi Band. I do not believe that the same can be said about any other member here. They are not currently acting as a negotiator for any party that has any interest in this Panel, in this discussion.

In response to your question, Mr. Chairman, we are only looking for the recognition that our apprehension is reasonable and, secondly, assurances from Dr. Wilkinson that he will do his utmost to be unbiased and to make fair decisions and recommendations as a member of the Panel.

If you can address those assurances to the President of LIA, that will satisfy LIA.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be in writing, is that correct?

THERESA ROWE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

Dr. Wilkinson, you would like to say something else? Go ahead.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Okay, I take it that you say that I act as a negotiator for the Naskapis. I would like to know to what negotiations are you referring?

THERESA ROWE: To the negotiations mentioned in the Summary of Facts that was provided for me. Since I have no first-hand knowledge of these facts, certainly if you require we can have witnesses deduce evidence about them. But what was given to me here today, and what I presented, was a summary of those facts.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Okay, but I think there is one important point that you omitted from your summary. You were referring to negotiations that have taken place between LIA and the Government of Quebec and various other parties. Those negotiations have, in fact, terminated. There are now documents summarizing those negotiations, an Agreement in Principle, and an Annex. They have been submitted to the parties, and the parties will advise one another some time in November whether they will sign them.

But the negotiations are over. And just as a matter of detail, the negotiations ended before the work of this Panel began. Now whether there will be future negotiations or not, I do not know. If there are future negotiations, whether I will represent the Naskapis or someone else will represent the Naskapis I do not know.

Your brief gives the impression we are talking about on-going negotiations, and that is, quite simply, not the case. They ended.

3-16 Now with respect to your specific request, I am prepared to give an assurance that I shall act without bias. I will have to take into consideration whether I will give it directly to LIA, or whether I will give it to the Minister of the Environment, or to the Panel Chairman, or to the public of Canada as a whole. If I am to provide such a reassurance, I am providing it to anyone who might have concern.

Subject to further thought, I certainly will not give a recognition that there is a reasonable apprehension of bias. I do not believe that, on the knowledge of the facts, one would conclude that there is such a reasonable apprehension. I will, however, give, in an appropriate form, in writing, to an appropriate person, the guarantee of freedom of bias that you request.

But, again, I go back to what I said before. I think it is a mean man who will not promise, and your best protection is the fact that we are seven persons and the fact that the record of what we do is public.

May I just correct a minor error in your presentation. On several occasions you spoke of this Panel as having decision-making power, and that the apprehension of bias was especially important because we have decision-making power. We do not. We make recommendations. The decisions are made by the appropriate persons and organizations within the

4-1
ET:ET
Sept.29

Government of Canada; Environment Canada, National Defence and so on. But you will get your promise.

THERESA ROWE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Ms Rowe and Dr. Wilkinson.

Now we will invite the remaining three speakers to come forward in the order in which they gave their names to the Secretariat.

First of all, I would invite Mr. Ern Condon representing a group entitled the Concerned Citizens Opposed to the Base. Mr. Condon.

ERN CONDON: The next person is a two-person presentation, and we would like to do it jointly.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would like to make a joint presentation with Ms Anne Ferreira, is that correct?

If that is what you wish, that is perfectly okay. You may both go to the table at the same time.

ANNE FERREIRA: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I thought he was going to give the first half of the presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you were to agree between yourselves how you want to handle this. Either way it will be fine with us.

ERN CONDON: We are both in the ranks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please identify yourselves again, and the name of the organization.

---SUBMISSION BY ANNE FERREIRA AND ERN CONDON:

ANNE FERREIRA: My name is Anne Ferreira, and I am speaking for the Concerned Citizens Group Opposed to a NATO Base in Labrador.

ERN CONDON: My name is Ern Condon, and I speak for the same group.

In just starting off, I would like to say that in light of previous questions, and the opportunity to question and comment, there will be the possibility of some repetition. I do not know how we will work this as we go, but we will do the best we can.

We did have a little written sketch of what it is we hope to say. It is not very scientific, and not very well done, but it is available. We did provide it.

In terms of starting off, I think one of the things we, as Canadians, wanted to say and do was to congratulate you and the members of your Panel for thorough and specific, and the detailed nature of the Guidelines. I know, from the Committee's point of view, it was reassuring to see how detailed and specific they were and in that sense there was a sense of relief on our part, and hope in a way when we saw this. It was a relief to the degree that there is a legitimate forum, and this provides a legitimate forum in which we can state our genuine concerns regarding this proposal without fear of harrassment or intimidation. There is hope in the sense that once we have eventually put forward our concerns to you that your Panel would conclude, as we have done, that low level flying and the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre are not in the long-term best interests of Labrador and its people

I realize that we cannot outline details regarding the issues. We can only address, tonight, as you indicated in your preamble, the Guidelines. So we will do that as best we can, although there are times we will find it difficult to separate the two.

In light of these observations we will not proceed to outline some of the specific concerns and comments that we have, and even some questions. I hope there is an opportunity to seek clarification, because as an individual small group trying to review this and make some statements, there were many occasions when we struck terminology or points that we were not quite sure the meaning of. Some of these will be in the form of comments; others in the form of question.

We have tried to go through it following your procedures. We began with definitions. And I am trying to look as I go through, making sure we do not repeat something that has already been discussed.

Our very first point, and I will not belabour it here, was that, in terms of definitions, there was no definition of what a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is. That is the whole focus,

Sub., Condon

4-4

the goal. The hearings are not here for low level flying. The low level flying has been here for six years. The hoop-la and the carrot dangling and the hype is all with respect to the base itself, and to that particular aspect of this hearing coming to Labrador. It baffles me that it was neither presented, as I mentioned earlier, in my comments on the major statements, that it surprised me that it was not put forward earlier either by the military, or certainly even by the Panel itself, in terms of clearly defining that the whole objective is the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre.

Our second point is a definition again. It is a minor one, and probably repetitious. The whole idea that, at one stage, your definition indicates that the Panel intends to determine in advance the environmental and social impacts of low level flying in Labrador. We find that amusing, as you have mentioned in your thing, given the fact that it has been there for six years. So there is no advance assessment of the effect of low level flying in Labrador. It just was not done, as we have heard from the Major. It was an in-house review of what was available at the time. In our opinion this was not adequate.

Again a minor point. I would just like some clarification on this. You mentioned at the beginning of this presentation that the initiator and the proponent -- and your introductory comments in the

Guidelines say that it is in the Department of National Defence -- yet in your definition of initiator and proponent -- and I cannot find it right in front of me -- was vague and general in the sense that it could be the department or it could be another organization or another group. We had questions as to why that was left in a vague, generalized format when it was clear and specific and the initial proposal indicated who, in fact, was going to be the initiator and the proponent.

The question that it begs is: Will there be a NATO implication in there, or will it be some other group or organization coming on stream that could fill in that void?

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. It might be good if I respond to that right now.

In preparing these Guidelines, we did attempt to be consistent with similar documents on other projects, issued by other panels, and there was a slip made in this case in that the term proponent does not really apply in this case. The initiator, or initiating department, as defined at the beginning of the Guidelines, is indeed the Department of National Defence, and since this is a proposal of that department and there is no non-governmental organization which is a partner to that proposal, then there is in fact no proponent in this case.

ERN CONDON: Fine. Thank you for that clarification. I assumed it might have been that.

-6

Sub., Condon

Thank you.

The other thing, in terms of definitions, and I know that your definitions were specific to issues raised within the Guidelines -- and we were caught between needing clarification on definitions that might arise as part of the overall understanding of the issue -- and I would just like to mention a few things we feel could warrant further definitions or whatever. One would be the reference in the Guidelines to sonic boom. I think there is need for clarification on that particular point. What is a sonic boom? What are the implications of it? What are the difficulties with it that have been experienced with it in other places, and so on. I think it is a whole area the Panel might wish to pursue.

It refers to federal land, and of course one of the issues is Native land claims. I think definitions of what is perceived as federal land and what is perceived as Native lands, if there are any such thing, I think could be something else.

I know there was reference to the whole exclusion of Canadian Defence Policy and the NATO Defence Policy. Again, somewhere in the study it refers to -- I forget the terminology now -- justification for the project, and I do not see how you can do any of that without some grasp of what it is Canada is offering and why it is offering 100,000 square kilometers of the last wilderness in Labrador. As a nation why we are offering it, and why NATO wants it,

Sub., Condon

-7 and so on. These are just thoughts.

The last one is in relation to an item mentioned in the thing -- well I do not know, sir, if it was -- is radiation. I think the Major mentioned it in terms of the ranges and so on. I think there is radar control and there is a lot of radar involvement with tracking and the whole process involved in the operation. I think the whole concept of radiation emissions needs to be defined and looked at. Maybe that it further down the line, and not necessarily in here.

These are just a few concerns we had regarding definitions, and I think will plug in here on the points under the next item which was Introduction.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you.

As a preamble, I would like to say that some of the questions I have are mine, and I understand them and can elaborate on them. Others, in a sense, I have been asked to read them. Therefore, with the rest of the questions, I may not be able to elaborate upon them. I will read the question as it stands.

The first question deals with the Introduction, Area 2. We would like to know why the people represented by the Kativik Regional Government and the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement have direct inclusion in the negotiations, while our Innu and Inuit sisters and brothers of Labrador have been excluded from that process?

Shall I continue with our general questions, because this is the format from now on. We have mostly questions; not really statements, but questions. If someone would like to clarify, fine. If not, I will go on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Approximately how many questions would you anticipate?

ANNE FERREIRA: It would not take me any longer than it did earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am wondering if we should try to respond to each one in turn, or whether we should take them all under advisement and provide you with an answer in the near future.

ANNE FERREIRA: Which would you prefer? Whatever you would prefer, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the latter be satisfactory?

ANNE FERREIRA: Fine.

ERN CONDON: If I could interject here. In the sense of our trying to get a grasp on how we want to pursue it, some of these, at least the preliminary clarifications might help us focus. This is just one aspect now. It might help the other people and ourselves to focus on the ...

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. I will have to watch the time carefully. But I think there is a ready answer to the first question, and I think the best person here at the head table to answer it might

4-9 be Dr. Wilkinson. So I will ask him to do that, please.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Okay. I would like to begin with the clarification.

The Naskapi-Montagnais and Innu were not excluded, but for various reasons they were treated in a different way.

To summarize this, the reason is that the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement created an environmental regime for the territory in Quebec north of the 55th parallel. It set up committees, it specificed membership.

When this project arose for review, there was the possibility that it might have to be reviewed twice for its effects north of the 55th parallel, in conformity with Section 23 of the James Bay Agreement, and everywhere else where it might have effects, in conformity with the Environmental Assessment and Review procedure of the federal government.

In order to improve the quality of the review, it was decided to study the possibility of combining these two regimes; Section 23 of the James Bay Agreement and EARP. There were, therefore, negotiations between the Kativik Regional Government, the Naskapis, indeed, and Environment Canada. A way was agreed to combine the two proceeses into one.

There are no land claim settlements yet in the case of the Naskapis-Montagnais and Innu.

4-10

Therefore this kind of consideration did not exist. Nevertheless, in the scoping exercises, in the exercises that were done to define this document, the Naskapi and the Montagnais, the Innu, the Inuit of Labrador as well as the many other groups, were all involved quite as much as the Inuit of northern Quebec or the Naskapis of Schefferville.

Does that answer your question.

ERN CONDON: Essentially, then, what you are saying is that these other Innu people were included because their rights are agreed to as opposed to assumed, or whatever?

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Yes.

ERN CONDON: The distinction in terms of whether you are included formally is the documentation?

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Yes.

ERN CONDON: Because I assume they were included because they justified -- and again in the context of the previous speaker indicated -- all of these people have lived together for centuries and criss-crossing one another's border. So obviously if one had a justification for a claim, the other would automatically, in my opinion, have a justification. And the only distinction in this case, in terms of being formally included, is the document signed in 1974, or whenever it was.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Yes, that is the reason. There was a legal requirement because of the agreement, to consult some in one way. The others were then consulted and involved in another way.

ERN CONDON: Would it be fair to say that in terms of their inclusion, and in terms of fact that they have an agreement was because they had a legitimate claim and that previous governments agreed that they did have a legitimate claim based on their ancestry and history in the area? Is that why they had that claim?

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: The governments, through signing land claims agreements, have agreed that the Naskapis of Schefferville, the Inuit of Quebec and the James Bay Crees have a claim which has been settled. I understand that the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais has filed a Statement of Claim which the government accepts to the point where they have started negotiating. I understand that the situation for the Inuit of Labrador is about the same, and that negotiations will begin there in the near future. I have less knowledge of the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, but I believe that they are working, perhaps, to get a claim accepted. I am not terribly sure of that.

ERN CONDON: Thank you.

ANNE FERREIRA: My second point here is not really a question, you will be glad to know. It is more of a request. I might add it is not just from my group, but we have had people who are not opposed to the base at all come to our meetings, because they

-12

felt they would not be able to attend this meeting. They specifically requested us to raise this point: that they would like to see more emphasis placed on the specifics of the maintenance, termination and demobilization factors. In particular, monetary controls on these. In other words, they are concerned about the termination of the project and what effect it would have on any benefits they are promised at the moment. That was a concern I wanted to mention. I realize you mention it in your Guidelines, but they concerned enough about it that we thought we would mention it.

My question is: Could you tell us -- and I would appreciate a very brief comment on this one, if possible, tonight -- what sort of impact you predict will not be evaluated on the basis of ecological theory. I am referring to methodology, Page 9. I will go on with the whole question. What guidelines would be used to evaluate those impacts that could not be evaluated on the basis of ecological theory? That was a query we had. And how will you accommodate cultural variance and perception?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else on the Panel care to tackle that question?

Which particular paragraph are you referring to on page 9?

ANNE FERREIRA: I am referring to paragraph 3, right at the end. It refers to Beanlands and Duinker's study and then it says: "with appropriate modifications for those impacts that cannot be evaluated on the basis of ecological theory."

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think what we mean by that is that there is no study parallelling the Beanlands and Duinker study that deals with social, cultural and economic impact and how to deal with those. What we are suggesting is that the general methodology suggested by Beanlands & Duinker in their publication be adapted for the purpose of predicting other sorts of impacts, biophysical impacts: that is social, cultural and etc.

ANNE FERREIRA: I see. We would actually really like to see Beanlands and Duinker, and I realize it is available from Dalhousie, but we wondered if it would be easier to get it from you, if you provide such a service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. It is available in any quantity from our office. Just speak to Mr. Clarke about it.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may have some copies with us, as a matter of fact. Speak to Mr. Clarke about that. In the meantime, Dr. Wilkinson would like to say something to that same question.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Okay. I would like to comment on the second part of your question, which is how would the study accommodate different cultural values. I think in number 1, on page 10, we

4-14 do try to address that. We say that in the event that different groups assign different values to certain components, the proponent must explain and justify the values that he retains, or must present a series of analyses based upon the different value systems that he identifies. Because really the heart of a lot of environmental impact studies is dependent on the values you have. You arrive at differing conclusions.

ANNE FERREIRA: I understand that. I also understand that your monitoring program intends to identify the impacts that have not in fact been identified up to then. I am satisfied with that. But I am still curious to know just how you would approach a topic such as low level flying.

I do not think the Panel had anything to do with the study, but just as an example about three weeks ago there was a report on TV about someone going up to the Goose Bay area to study low level flying, and they were measuring in decibels the level of the noise that people would be subjected to. I believe this was what the report said: they were planning to have the Innu come and meet with them, and they did not show up. It occurred to me then that perhaps the Innu would look at the situation from such a different viewpoint that they would not be interested in decibels so much as in the impact, the phsychological emotional impact upon them that it would not have much to do with noise level to them.

15 So they would consider it meaningless.

I know the methodology is there, but I would like to know just exactly what whoever is gathering the data would do to make sure that the problem is looked at in a global, a 100 per cent point of view wherever you could look at it, not just from the standard methodologies that have been used, if you know what I mean. So, it is a concern.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe the study to which you refer is one being conducted by the Canadian Public Health Association at the request of the Department of Health of the Province of Newfoundland.

To answer the rest of your question, it is general practice for panels like this not to dictate to an initiator or a proponent precisely the methodologies to be used in the studies required to support the Environmental Impact Statement. At the same time there is expertise on the Panel; there is expertise amongst the staff of the office which supports this process, and if the Department of National Defence wants to inquire about appropriate methodologies, we are all available at any time to talk to them about this.

I do not believe we would be able to specify, at this time, which methodologies might be used by National Defence in responding to these Guidelines when they are issued.

ANNE FERREIRA: I understand. Thank you for that clarification.

4-16

But you would obviously be monitoring them to make sure that they are thorough as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you.

There were some other issues which I have been asked to raise. If there is time, I will continue.

With respect to the effect of sea range bombing on the northern cod stock, on general shipping patterns, will there be controlled or restricted areas?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is the sort of question that might appropriately be answered by the Department of National Defence. I wonder if Major McCabe would care to respond to that at the present time?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: In response to the question, yes, there would be some kind of restrictions as there currently exist. We have some sea ranges, if you want to call them that, in existence on both coasts of Canada at this time. To give you an example of one -- some of them, of course, are connected with Navy or maritime operations -- we do conduct air-to-air gunnery with aircraft over the sea. At times that those are active -- and there are clearly defined areas published -- notices are put out to maritime shipping and also to aviation interests warning of the activity that is coming up on that. So, a similar thing would apply.

ANNE FERREIRA: In other words, you have never had any problems?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I would not say we have not had any problems. We occasionally get a few people, fishermen for example, who have been a little slow in vacating an area, or something like that. Then, also, some of the ships do not move too quickly, and the timing is not right, but we try and accommodate that. No activity takes place until a thorough scouring of the area confirms that there are indeed no ships there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please excuse me. I would like to ask each speaker to make sure that his microphone is live before he or she starts to speak. We want to get everything on the record, and we have an interpreter at the back who is attempting to provide a translation for our French-speaking people in the room. If you would make sure that the red light is on before you start to speak.

Now, while Major McCable is still at the microphone, I wonder if any of your other questions would be regarding the nature of the project, so he could answer them before he goes back to his seat.

ANNE FERREIRA; I do not think so.

ERN CONDON: I can add a couple of words, if the Major would respond.

In that same vein, my question -- and again this is indirectly a question, but is also a caveat to the Panel in regard to the sea element aspect of it -- has to do with the implication for offshore drilling -- as everyone is aware, there is a potential for offshore gas off the Labrador coast as well.

My other question would be: in these sea bases, and so on, does it also include submarine involvements in these with regard to missiles or involvement in general in the whole process?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: In response to the latter part of your question, the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is primarily oriented towards aviation training. The anti-shipping role is normally against surface shipping. The type of tactic etc. that would be practiced might be, I suppose, used against a submarine, but if I understand your question correctly, to my knowledge at this very early stage there would be no submarines actually involved, and there would certainly be no missiles involved.

ERN CONDON: Again, in relation to the whole thing -- and I posed this back in September -- as I understand it the other base we have which is a comparable base which is being proposed for Labrador is Cold Lake, if I am correct. I stand to be corrected on that, but I know it has been referred to as comparable. And one of the things that Cold Lake has is the Cruise Missile. I am wondering what projections there might be with regard to that item in Labrador.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: If I could just

1019 clarify something. Cold Lake does not have the Cruise Missile. The Cold Lake range has been used for Cruise Missile tests. It does not have the Cruise Missile. It is an American weapons system.

Secondly, to my knowledge, in the scope of the centre as defined by the NATO working group, there has been no mention of any requirement for any kind of Cruise Missile-related activity. So I must assume that that is not a requirement.

ANNE FERREIRA: I would like to conclude with three brief things. All of them are addressed in the Guidelines. We are concerned about them, so I would like to emphasize them.

The implications of the project on potential wilderness and wildlife parks and preserves is a concern of people who have met with us.

Two, the implications of the project on future travel and tourism development, and the implication of the project on future resource development. This is a very broad area, and I am sure you will agree they are very important.

That is all I have to say on behalf of this group unless Ern wishes to add anything.

ERN CONDON: You can see we had difficulty co-ordinating this. Actually my question, and I think I raised it with you, Mr. Chairman, back in your summer visit to this area, and that was in regard to, and I think it was somewhere in the statements, and I think Dr. Wilkinson referred to the fact that other

4-20 groups having values, judgements and positions in regard to it, and an opportunity for the proponents to defend their value judgement overriding the value judgements of other intervenors or whatever, my question -- and we have it in written form here somewhere -- is in the form of a question about funding to opposing groups who might want to outline in specific detail the valid research opportunities and secretarial help and whatever, in terms of putting the case forward. I wonder what you might respond in that regard.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are asking about is what is normally called intervenor funding, in a situation like this. Without being able to provide specific details at the present time, I can say that there will be a program of intervenor funding. There will be funds made available, on request, to intervenors for the purposes of participating in the review. There will be certain criteria involved and certain systems set up to administer these funds, and I think you might expect that there will be an announcement from the federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office concerning the subject of intervenor funding in the near future.

Do you have any other question?

ERN CONDON: If I could just review a couple of other little points. I hope we are not over-stepping our time, but the point is when you look at the cost involved in bringing the number of

4-21 people that are here tonight into this room to hear this, I feel a little bit pressured in the context of time and opportunity to ask questions. I think if we are talking about cutting out the heart of Labrador, 100,000 square miles of it, and making it exclusive territory for war games, I think it warrants an opportunity for everyone to feel a little like they can take the time to say whatever it is they want to say.

Just a couple of questions, if I could. I know the Major referred,in his introductory comments, to the present low level flying and the opportunity that people had to use the territory, and that it was simply a matter of ...

As a matter of fact, when Colonel David was here in September he referred to the fact that anybody could go into the territory, and all they had to do was notify -- either Innu or Inuit, whoever was going into the territory -- the military, and these areas would be blocked out so that no flights would go over there. I think his terminology was that they would be considered as enemy sites to be avoided by the planes, and you could make it part of the game. In relation to the Innu claims, I would like to point to an analogy. It is the Arctic analogy with regard to Canada. I think our military and our government has the perception that we own the Arctic, and we do not take too kindly to either the United States sending their ships through it, or

4-22 the Russians sending their submarines or ships. I do not think, assuming we are claiming that territory, that we would be content with being told: As long as you notify that you are going through, we would accept that as justification for them being there. In this case, in relation to the land claims, I can understand why the Innu do not want to feel that every time they make a move in the territory that they have considered from ancestral times to be theirs, they should feel that they have to check in and report in and report here and there. They view the territory as being theirs in the same way we view the Arctic. So when the Americans said they were running their thing through, we did not say okay, that's fine. As long as you let us know you are sending your planes through, or your submarines, or your ice-breakers, or whatever they sent through. My point is that that is not enough in terms of justification for being there.

The other thing, just a couple of points. In relating to the testing which Anne referred to, I wanted to make the point that there is a significant difference between the testing of an over-flight, a surprise one versus an expected one. If you are over-flown when you are expecting it, and you have notified people that they are going to be over-flown, and you are expecting to be over-flown. It is a little different,in terms of the psychological impact, to be over-flown when you are waiting for it,

4-23

or known that sooner or later it is going to come, rather than if you are out there and out of the blue you happen to have somebody come screeching over your head at high speed.

I am not sure if there is anything else here. I guess that probably should do.

Do you have anything else, Anne?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your comments. I hope you do not feel that you are under undue time pressure here. Since I thought there were going to be four presentations, I did suggest a 20-minute time limit in all fairness to the other speakers. If you feel you need another five or ten minutes, since there is only one more scheduled speaker after this, please feel free to take that amount of time.

In the meantime, I think I saw Major McCabe indicate that he might like to say something at this point. Is that right, Major?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: One of my tasks in these public hearing, apart from providing information on the project proposal, is also to attempt to clear up any misconceptions that the public might have, possibly due to lack of information or other sources of information that might have been provided.

Mr. Condon made the statement that I wish to clarify. There has been no statement or even suggestion made by the Department of National Defence that 100,000 square kilometers of the heart of

-24

Labrador would be carried out to the total exclusion of everybody else. That is not the intent and never will be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Mr. Condon and Ms Ferreira, would you like to have any more time or do you feel ...

ERN CONDON: I would like to read one little aspect into the record in relation to, probably a sense of paranoia that we have as a group, a few people who are proposing some questions that we feel are legitimate and should be raised in relation to it. If you will recall, our introduction did mention concerns along that line.

I want to refer you to a document. There have been numerous documents in both local papers in terms of editorials, and again I think it behooves the committee to have an awareness of the threatening mentality that people who oppose or question this operation have.

There have been editorials, and there are copies of these available, where people who have spoken, myself in particular, have been referred to as being asinine because they even dare to question a project that is going to provide jobs for Labrador. There have been others where all kinds of things have been said.

This is a document I would like to put on the record. It is a document produced, in case you have not seen it, by the Combined Councils of Labrador under the editorship of Mr. Steve Michelin. This particular document, which is referred to as a comprehensive document outling all sides of this particular issue, and I wanted to refer to it. It goes on to say that we state our stand on the issue has been unhypocritical, uncensored, and so on. The two primary concerns are that the majority of people who are against the Goose Bay proposal are not Labradorians, have never been here and mostly all belong to radical extremist, and,in many cases, pink groups, so that he knows where we are coming from in terms of feeling a little bit concerned about even expressing a view. It goes on to say that being a total voluntary group -- which he is referring to the Combined Councils as being -- elected by the people of Labrador -- and then in brackets, if that counts anything in the eyes of the protesters -- we do not have large monetary and technological resource bases to pursue it, and these groups which are opposing have gathered through donation of "sucker dollars" and government breaks through being allowed to be tax free, and tax deductible. As Labradorians we know what we want for ourselves and our children, and we are willing to work for it, given the chance, not to have it handed to us by government. The inference, as you know, is that those who are opposing are to some degree not prepared to work, and so on.

There are two references in this article which again indicate the concerns that are dear for

,-1
ET:ET
Sept.29

those of us who want to express opposition, and there are only two cartoons in whis whole thing which are a compilation of articles which have been in the papers, and I am sure you will want to have access to. One of them contains a picture of two bearded people who say: I am going to pick up my UIC cheque, then I'm going around to the university to see what is holding up my education grant. Meanwhile, you go by the free clinic to check out your Herpes, pick up your birth control pills and my new glasses, and then stop by the Social Services for your welfare cheque. We will meet at the Newfoundland Hotel at noon and join Greenpeace for the mass picket against low level flying in Labrador. I understand they are actually trying to make people to go to work up there.

What I am pointing out is that there is a lot of vindictiveness involved in this, and there is another one that is even more despicable. My point is to let you see at the beginning of these hearings that those of us who have concerns and reservations are putting them forward with some trepidation and some concern, and with no funding or financing in the way of researching or co-ordinating, as you can see.

I think that given the significance of this, the wildlife preserves in particular, my point is: When Colonel David was here -- and I will not challenge the amount in Labrador, per se -- it was my understanding of the written material, unless I am reading the wrong material, that the 100,000 square kilometers was in that documentation, and, technically, it did not include Labrador alone. It included the upper portion of the range which included Quebec and the lower portion would include part of Quebec. It was roughly 100,000 kilometers being delineated. Not necessarily all of this would be totally exclusive for air that would be controlled for entry purposes. But there are 100,000 square kilometers being viewed.

In the Colonel's presentation, back in September, he indicated on his maps and charts, and part of all the video hoop-la that was there, that the whole coastal strip would be untouched because of migratory bird patterns. As a matter of fact his words were to the effect that, because our jets have already had negative contact with the birds, we have lost two elements, in other words, two people were dead as a result of crashes in this area with regard to low level flying. Now we find that there is an inclusion of the sea range, which includes flying back and forth out over the coast somewhere which was clearly indicated from the beginning, and for anyone who was at that meeting, they referred to that whole coastal strip, right up and down the centre block, those of you who have the picture of what they were talking about, it was the centre block only. This whole coastal strip was being avoided for two reasons, the people who live here and the migratory birds. I wanted to make that point as well.

5-3

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Before you leave the table, I would first like to ask whether anybody on the Panel has a question they would like to put to you regarding your presentation?

I believe Major McCabe might like to have a last word, is that right?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Once again, just for clarification, Colonel David's mention of that coastal area,which is depicted in the film that I gather some people have seen, is not an exclusion area for flying. It is an area where low level flying is avoided. As such, because the aircraft are doing primarily low level activity, they tend to stay away from there because of the problems with birds.

In connection with the sea range, if aircraft were transiting out to a sea range, considering the distance from Goose Bay and fuel consumption, etc., I would suggest it is unlikely that they would be going low level. If indeed they had to you would end up with very narrow corridors being defined.

At present, again for clarification, that area along the coastal strip is restrictive flying in the sense that we recommend that pilots not do any low level in there. They may be at medium altitudes or higher. If that helps you a bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Once again to our two speakers, thank

you very much for your presentation. Please do not feel that you have to apologize for what you refer to as a lack of co-ordination in your presentation. We are very grateful to get any specific comments on the Draft Guidelines since that, after all, is the main purpose of these meetings. Thank you again.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason I am reluctant to get up at the moment is that I believe the next person in line is Jim Prowse.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. That is the next name that appears on my list.

ANNE FERREIRA: This is why I had asked the Major stay. Because he has some questions for him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Prowse come up then.

ANNE FERREIRA: Unfortunately, Mr. Prowse had to go to work. He left his questions with me, if you would indulge them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are quite welcome to do that.

ANNE FERREIRA: Some of the questions I may take the liberty of not asking, if they have already been dealt with.

One of the questions, and I would address it to the Major, is: What is the purpose of low level flying?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I will try and be as brief as possible.

5-5

In the context of low level flying, and I alluded to it in my presentation, technologies, tactics have changed over the years. One of the things that has advanced significantly is radar detection systems. There are two ways one can attempt to not be detected, if you like. One is using the electronic jamming means that I mentioned earlier. That is the sort of training that is done with electronic warfare using on-board systems. The other is by trying to get underneath the radar coverage, i.e. extremely low. This is a difficult thing to practice to carry out meaningful and beneficial tactical training, particularly with multiple aircraft in areas that are extremely small or are congested with man-made hazards such as towers, wires, buildings etc. So that is what it is for. It is really an attempt to defeat enemy threat systems, like enemy radar.

ANNE FERREIRA: In other words, it has nothing to do with hitting particular targets and getting closer to them to hit them?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: The ultimate objective obviously in any kind of weapons delivery role, is to reach your objective and to reach it successfully. There are many hazards and threats along the way. Some of them are natural hazards, as I mentioned, such as obstacles you can run into. The others are manned hazards; enemy systems.

ANNE FERREIRA: Still with this question, there is one more part I am not very clear on.

So the airplanes are going very low so they cannot be detected by radar. Does this mean that they would also not be detected by people? If I am in a field, and the airplane is coming at me. Is that the reason I do not hear it until it is right upon me? Is it that the airplane is coming so fast I do not hear it until it is upon me, or is it that it is evading this radar cover? In other words, other aircraft would not be aware of its presence and I, with my sense, am not aware of it either until it is right upon me.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I do not know about other aircraft not being aware that its presence.

ANNE FERREIRA: I must have misunderstood you.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: No, it is ground-based radar systems.

That is really the reason why one often does not get too much of a forewarning if aircraft are flying that low, particularly in rolling terrain they are travelling so fast and so low, that quite often that is the case.

ANNE FERREIRA: The concern of Jim Prowse too was that there be lots of specifics on opportunities for economic development; the number of jobs, duration of employment, level of skill required, local or imported labour. I realize you addressed some of this question in your initial comments, and you said that now it is a proposal. Obviously you do not have the exact figures as they will be in future.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Just to comment on that, I did mention that National Defence is conducting a study on the hypothetical scenario. There are certain models available, not just the defence thing they use throughout Canada. With any kind of project of whatever scale, there are computer models that can give projections of employment opportunities and even, if there is something to compare it to, for example Cold Lake, you can even come up with an idea of specific types of jobs. That is on-going right now.

ANNE FERREIRA: Thank you. The other question has to do with the impact of the project on non-renewable resource-based commercial activity, such as iron ore mining which is so important in Labrador. Is there any connection there that you can foresee?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: In fact I cannot answer that. I believe that is covered in the Guidelines where the proponent must assure, in its Environmental Impact Statement, the Panel and ultimately the public that other interests that may possibly conflict have been addressed. I believe that is in there.

ANNE FERREIRA: The last question has to do with who would be responsible for implementing

5-8

the monitoring program. Perhaps this should be addressed to the Panel, and not to you sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think in the monitoring programs there would be items that might be the responsibility of the Department of National Defence and there might be items which would be the responsibility of one or other departments of the government; perhaps the federal government, perhaps one or other of the provincial governments could be involved here.

Our hope is that in the Environmental Impact Statement there would be some indication, not only what the monitoring should be but whose responsibility each item should be. If it is not clear enough in there, then I would think that the Panel would make some attempt to identify that in its report, so everyone would understand which particular agency would be responsible.

ANNE FERREIRA: I think the concern inherent in this question is that since the proponent is the Department of National Defence, how could that department also monitor the activities?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is difficult at this point to say what might be the items in a monitoring program, but I think one could imagine the need to provide certain information on an on-going basis. A particular item might be such that the best person to provide that information would be the Department of National Defence. I do not know right now what sort of information that might be, but I could imagine

-9 that sort of situation turning up. If that were the case, then there would obviously have to be some sort of watch-dog or control system over it to make sure that that particular item of monitoring was being done as intended, and that the information was being provided on whatever regular basis was seen to be necessary.

Is that the end of your questions?

ANNE FERREIRA: Yes, it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Yes, Mr. Condon?

---FURTHER SUBMISSION BY ERN CONDON:

I would like to make a parting comment, if I could.

There is a qualification to be made. Our committee's opposition to the NATO base should not be perceived as an opposition to the development and to progress and jobs and so on. We have a vision of Labrador as being a unique wilderness area, the last one in eastern North America. We see it in that context, and we prefer to see it in that context as a real, natural wilderness area as opposed to an artificial war zone. It is in that context that our opposition is being put forward.

The other thing I would like to mention in relation to the committee reviewing this, is that Labrador is perceived -- I do not know how far across the world, but certainly back a number of years ago Audubon came -- and we were talking about birds a while back, and he was one of the great naturalists in

Sub., Condon

5-10

the bird field, at least -- and he came up a number of times sketching in the early 1800's. Back in 1905 or whenever it was, there were people coming up from New York, traversing Labrador, being challenged by the wilderness, and writing books like "Lure of the Labrador Wild"; and Time/Life publications put out productions and fantastic reviews on the uniqueness of Labrador and the significance of it as a natural site. I am putting all this out in the context that down in the United States, this past summer -- there were people up here, there were people over. I am sure people from Labrador would have heard there was a canoe team from France having difficulty in the wilderness, so they were attracted to the challenge of the wildlife aspects of Labrador. They were coming over here. Johnny Carson was the other one I just thought of from the States. He came up and spent time in this area, again obviously attracted by the uniqueness of it.

Our vision is to try and preserve it as best we can. We feel that that does not hinder development and production in other areas as well, and that there are sufficient jobs and benefits to be derived from it, keeping it as much in its natural state as possible. Just this month the road has finally gone through. You can now, with the exception of a bridge, drive in and out of here. For the first time ever, people can leave New York or Montreal or Toronto, or wherever, and drive right into the heart-

Sub., Condon

land of Labrador. Our chambers of commerce and our elected municipal governments are in the process of trying to develop the tourist industry at a significant level and attract tour operators to bring people in here. If this area retains its natural uniqueness -- and again, if you look at the map and look at the north, you will see significant wilderness, wild life preserves up in the northern parts of Canada, up in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, and about the only exclusion in that area is in Labrador, and it is a detrimental exclusion if we look at it in that light. There are enough jobs and opportunities in Labrador without importing the militarization that other people in the European countries do not want. I guess that is the reason they are coming over here in the first place. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation.

I thing perhaps the term "proponent" deserves a little further clarification. I mentioned earlier that perhaps the term "proponent" does not entirely apply in the case of this review. It might be more correct to say that the Department of National Defence is filling the role of both initiator and proponent in this case. Through the course of the review, therefore, you may hear both terms used almost interchangeably. I guess there would not be anything wrong with that situation.

I would offer one last opportunity for

,-12

anyone else in the audience who feels that he or she would like to say something to the Panel, to come forward and sit at the table and identify yourself clearly. Please make sure that the red light is on before you start to speak.

---SUBMISSION BY JOE ROBERTS:

Thank you. I had occasion to meet you last month. My name is Joe Roberts. I am a Councillor with the Town of Wabush. I am also Western Vice-Chairman of the Combined Councils of Labrador. I was not prepared to say anything when I came down, but I have to offer a rebuttal.

In Mr. Condon's display of our newspaper, on the 22nd and 23rd of this month we had a Combined Councils meeting in Goose Bay, and that newsletter came up for discussion. It was the unanimous decision of all the Councils at that meeting that the magazine be continued, and it was stated that it was the only format the communities have of finding out what is going on with the Council and with its organizations. They view it as an informational package. It is not meant to be derogatory in any shape or form.

I think there was an invitation extended to you, or to your Panel, to attend that meeting. Did you receive it?

THE CHAIRMAN: An invitation to attend the Combined Councils meeting? I do not remember any invitation coming into the Panel, or into our office.

-13 Are you sure it was sent?

JOE ROBERTS: I think there was a representative there, Carolyn Maybee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is right. She is a temporary employee of our office who is running a public information office out of Goose Bay, and I understand that she did attend. I do not remember an invitation coming in, to be quite honest.

JOE ROBERTS: There were several questions put to the lady, and she was unable to answer them. I would hope that when you go to Goose Bay, you sit down with the Chairman of the Combined Councils and take under advisement some of the questions the communities on the coast had concerning the assessment panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: He intends to appear before the Panel at Happy Valley-Goose Bay, is that correct?

JOE ROBERTS: I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is he going to contact the Panel and put those questions to us, or are you saying that those questions were already put to ...

JOE ROBERTS: No. The questions, Doctor, were already put to the representative from the Environmental Assessment Review Board Panel, but she was not able to answer them.

So, my question to you is: Do you aniticipate meeting with the Chairman of the Combined Councils and addressing those questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: I will certainly do my best to do that. Could you give me the specifics on his name and a means of contacting him?

JOE ROBERTS: Yes, certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Would anyone else care to speak?

If not, then, I guess we can call the meeting to an end.

I would like to thank each and every one of you for coming here tonight. I think particularly those people who have made presentations.

I think I have already indicated in my opening remarks that this is the first round of meetings that the Panel will be holding in this review. At the stage, next spring or summer, when the Environmental Impact Statement has been presented, it is possible that at that time there may be a further round of public information meetings, depending on the need at that time.

Of course, there will be public hearings to discuss the project probably in the fall of next year. I would anticipate that if there are continuing expressions of interest from the Wabush and Labrador City area, that we would intend to include this location in any further round of meetings.

So, thank you again, and good night.

---WHEREUPON THE HEARING ADJOURNED AT 9:20 P.M.

Volume

2

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	SCHEFFERVILLE	ENDROIT
DATE	September/septembre 30, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	2	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street,   Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario.   K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS. STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO—OTTAWA—WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Notre Dame School Gymnasium, Schefferville

DATE: September/septembre 30, 1986.

VOLUME: 2

OFFICIAL REPORTERS: Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.
PER: Eleanor Thomson
Francine Allard

INDEX

	PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman	94
Presentation by Major David McCabe	101

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Gilles Poirier	113
Auralien Gill	117
Denis Brassard	125
Mr. Kagus	127
Auralien Gill	131
Jean-Baptist Laurent	132
Pauline Vollant	134
George Gabriel	147
Joe MacKenzie	148
Ms. Assini	149
Joseph Jean-Pierre	150
Mathieu André	151
Camil Vollant	161
Bruno Pierre Harvey	176
Bernard Cléry	196
J.C. deMontigny	233
Gilles Poirier	239
Samson Einish on behalf of Chief Joe Guanish	244
Auralien Gill	255

* * * * *

---Upon Commencing at 2:30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mesdames et messieurs, bonjour. Bienvenue. My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Panel, sitting at this table, which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of existing and proposed military flying activities over certain parts of Labrador and Quebec.

Before beginning the meeting, I understand that the Chief of the Band Council, Mr. Alexandre MacKenzie, would like to speak to us.

Mr. MacKenzie?

CHIEF ALEXANDRE MacKENZIE: (Speaks in Innu).

MR. JOE MacKENZIE: (Prayer in Innu).

MR. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks in Innu).

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

I would like now to introduce the Members of the Panel. Beginning on that end of the table to my right, that is to your left: Dr. Paul Wilkinson, who is a consultant living in Montreal, who has worked extensively with the Native people of Quebec; next to Dr. Wilkinson, Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart lives in the Ottawa area, he operates a small farm and, before his retirement, before he started to operate the farm, he was employed in the Armed Forces of Canada as Brigadier-General; to my left, right here next to me, is Mr. Tom Northcott, who is a biologist. He operates his own consulting firm in St. John's, Newfoundland and who has extensive knowledge of the wildlife of Newfoundland and Labrador; next to Mr. Northcott is Mr. Tim McNeill, who lives in Makkovik, Labrador. Mr. McNeill operates a small business there and has extensive knowledge of the way of life in the interests and the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador; at the end of the table, to your right, is Mr. William Jourdain, who is a resident of Sept-Iles, who has, in the past, been quite active in the affairs of the Montagnais Band Council and has also been involved in business affairs.

I apologize for the absence of the other Member of our Panel, Mrs. Beatrice Watts, who lives in North West River, Labrador. She is, unfortunately, unable to be with us today due to an illness of a member of her family.

This Panel is assisted by a group of three persons, which we call the Panel Secretariat. I would like to introduce the Members of the Secretariat to you, if they are here in the room at the present time. The Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. Mr. Martin, if you are here, would you identify yourself? Thank you.

The second Member of the Secretariat is Mr. Michel Bourgon. Michel is not in the room at the moment but I will ask him to introduce himself to you when he comes in later.

The third Member of the Secretariat is Mr. Jim Clarke, who is sitting at the back of the room.

He is just standing up, so you can see him, if you wish.

I have introduced those people to you because they are very helpful to the Panel in making arrangements for meetings and, if you wish to have any information about this environmental review process -- for example, if you wanted to receive any of the publications that are available from the office where we are employed, then you should speak to one of the Members of the Secretariat.

I would like for a few minutes to talk about why we are holding these meetings, why we are here in Schefferville today and why we have asked you to come along. In 1974 the Government of Canada decided that it would like to consult the people of Canada more closely before approving large resource development projects, resource use projects. So, at that time, the Government of Canada established an environmental review process which provides for the Minister of Environment to appoint a panel, such as this one, to conduct a public review of such proposed projects well in advance of the time when they were approved. So that, anyone who is interested in the project or interested in the possible impacts and effects that the project may have on the environment or on their lives, will have an opportunity to speak to the Panel. The Panel can hear what they have to say and the Panel can make a report to the Minister of Environment.

With regard to the review of these military flying activities, I would like to briefly outline this process in six steps.

The review of the military flying activities began about six months ago, in February of 1986, when the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment of Canada and described a proposal that it is considering. That proposal has two parts: One involves the low level flight training activities which, I am sure, you have heard about, which have been going on for approximately six years. The proposal is to continue with those activities and perhaps involve other countries which are not involved at the present time, so that there might be an increase in that activity of low level flying. The other part of the proposal is to establish a flight training centre for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, at Goose Bay, Labrador.

In a few minutes you will hear a description of that project but, at the time that the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment in February, it asked the Minister to appoint a panel to conduct a public review of this proposal.

Also, at that time, the Department of National Defence suggested that the Panel should examine certain important things. As a result of that, the process moved into the second step. That was the appointment of the Panel in July of 1986. The Minister of Environment appointed the Panel and gave the Panel certain instructions which we call the terms of reference. These terms of reference tell the Panel exactly what subjects should be examined in the course of the review.

During the spring and the summer of 1986 meetings were held involving the staff of the Federal Environmental Review Office in Ottawa and certain interested organizations, such as agencies of the federal government and of the provincial governments of Newfoundland and Quebec and also of representatives of the Native people.

As a result of all that, the end of step number two in this process was that the Panel published, in August of this year, a document which we call Draft Guidelines. This document will eventually be the instructions which the Panel will give to the Department of National Defence and which they will use to guide them in writing a report, which we call the Environmental Impact Statement.

This brings us into step number three of the review, which is where we are at the present time. We are now holding public meetings and one of the reasons we are holding these meetings is to ask people like you whether this document, called Draft Guidelines, is complete or whether it is not.

We are holding these meetings in a great many places, approximately 16 locations, during the months of September and October. After we have finished these meetings, we will meet as a Panel and we will make any changes to that document that we think may be necessary.

After that, in December of this year, we will present the final form of that document to the Department of National Defence. Then, step four will begin, which is the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement by the Department of National Defence, where they will follow the instructions of the Panel, they will examine existing information, they will perhaps conduct some new studies which may be necessary and they will write the report. The end of step four will be the presentation of the Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel and we expect that to happen sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

Step number five in this process will be the examination of that Environmental Impact Statement and the holding of public hearings on the project. We expect that the Environmental Impact Statement will be available for the public to see and examine and for the Panel and the government also to examine during the summer and early fall of 1987.

If necessary, at that time if the Panel believes that the Environmental Impact Statement is not complete, that it is missing certain information, it may go back to the Department of National Defence and ask for more information. When the Panel is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Statement is complete, that is has followed the instructions, the guidelines that the Panel has given, then the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings to discuss the project, when we would go around for another set of meetings in most of the same locations as we are going to this month. We are expecting those public hearings to be held sometime in the fall of 1987.

The final step in the process, step number six, is the preparation and the submission of a report written by the Panel. That report will include a discussion of the project, a discussion of the expected impacts of the project and possible remedies to offset any undesirable impacts. It would also contain a recommendation whether the Flight Training Centre should be established at Goose Bay or whether it should not and, if it were to be approved, then it will recommend how it should be built and operated.

The Panel's report will also contain a recommendation, perhaps several recommendations, concerning the on-going low level flight training that has been going on now for several years. The Panel might, for example, recommend that certain changes be made in the way that those flights are carried on in order to remedy any unpleasant effects that those flights may be having at the present time.

That report from the Panel will be

presented to the Minister of the Environment and to the Minister of National Defence probably in late 1987 or early 1988. That will finish the review that the Panel is conducting and will end the work of the Panel. At that point the Panel would be disbanded, it will be finished.

Next, I would like to introduce a representative of the Department of National Defence whom we have invited to accompany the Panel to each of these meetings because we feel that it is very important that both the Panel and the public understands exactly what the proposal is. There has been some misinformation that has appeared from time to time and we feel that it is very important that everyone understand clearly exactly what is the project that the Panel is reviewing.

We have invited Major David McCabe, who is sitting at the front — and I will ask him to stand and identify himself -- to come with us. Our usual practice at each meeting will be to ask him to make a short presentation describing the project briefly and he is also willing to answer some questions about the nature of the project, if anyone would like to ask questions.

I think this would be the appropriate time, Major McCabe. Perhaps if the gentlemen at the table would be kind enough to make room for him to sit there so he can present his outline.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Ladies and gentlemen, Mr.

Chairman, good afternoon.

I would first like to thank you for attending this hearing and for giving me, as a representative of the project proponent, the Department of National Defence, an opportunity to briefly explain the proposals which are to be examined during the course of this study. I would like to provide a very brief background to explain developments which led to these proposals.

Goose Bay Airport has been associated with a variety of military flying activities since its construction in 1941, at which time it supported aircraft transiting to Europe during the hostilities of World War II. Post-war years saw many fluctuating periods of activity. During the relatively quiet years of the seventies Vulcan bombers of the Royal Air Force could be seen from time to time conducting low level flying training in the interior. As well, the United States Air Force maintained facilities to support transport aircraft staging through to re-supply American bases in Europe.

In 1980 the Royal Air Force expanded its operations somewhat to include other types of more modern aircraft, such as the F-4 Phantom, Jaguar, Buccaneer and Harrier. As well, the German Air Force, in its efforts to achieve better low level training for its air cruise, proposed a limited flying program at Goose Bay with F-4 Phantoms. Due to these proposed increases in low level flying activity in response to public concerns over possible detrimental effects which might result, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation of their proposed increased activity. This evaluation was limited to a study of existing data on such activity and was not intended to be an in-depth on-site study by specialists of all aspects of environmental and socio-economic issues.

The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment were negligible but, as existing data on caribou were inconclusive, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established. In order to co-ordinate and control all military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Co-ordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordination Centre handled all local military flight plans and advises air crew on a daily basis of local restrictions, such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps, when these are known.

The northern training area has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on maps with a five nautical mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low flying aircraft.

In a further effort to better handle allied military flying activity at Goose Bay, Canada this year, negotiated a multinational Memorandum of Understanding with each of the allied users at Goose Bay. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which existed between each allied user and several federal departments. Under the current agreement, the Canadian Forces are the sole agent for the control of allied military flying at Goose Bay. The agreement provides a definition of common use facilities which are equally cost-shared by all parties and dedicated use facilities, such as barracks and hangars, which are funded entirely by the user.

As well, each user is limited in number of aircraft and personnel which can be in Goose Bay at any one time. Any other nation wishing to train at Goose Bay must become party to this Memorandum of Understanding. Currently, there are four signators to the agreement, these being the Air Forces of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level tactical flying activity.

The Canadian Forces support the long range radar and approach control radar facilities and provides transient servicing to itinerant aircraft. As well, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay.

The United States Air Force continues to primarily support transient transport aircraft.

The Royal Air Force, although permitted

up to 25 aircraft, currently maintains nine Tornado fighter bombers during the flying season, which typically runs from March to end October.

The German Air Force is closer to its limit of 25 aircraft, rotating between Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets.

Current operations consist primarily of tactical missions of between two to four aircraft flying at a variety of altitudes, down as low as 100 feet above ground or, usually, one to one and a half hours per mission. The mission usually entails navigation training, tactical manoeuvering and, on occasion, delivery of inert weapons on a practice target range. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminant devices which sometimes contain a small smoke charge to indicate impact point.

Currently, there is only one target range approved for use. It is situated in the southern training area, approximately 65 nautical miles from Goose Bay. It is a circle eight nautical miles in diameter and is located in an open burned-out area. The area is clearly marked with signs printed in English, French and two Native languages.

A second proposed practice target area is being examined in the northern training area but it has not received final approval at this stage. Local interest groups are being consulted on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability by all concerned. The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding. In conjunction with this proposed increase, some development of a southern practice target range is taking place. This includes development of a simulated air field complex and supporting facilties, such as surface-to-air missile sites and operation centres. These are all constructed of basic materials such as logs and plywood and are meant to be replaced as required. There is no intention at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Flying training by the current users will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying and may include some limited night and poor weather flying. These two activities are designed to train crews in the use of the terrain following radar currently in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by current users, other nations have recently shown some interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Canada is negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing training facilities in Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present, the Dutch hope to commence a half season training program during the summer of 1987 flying F-16 fighters. Initially, 10 to 12 aircraft would be involved and about 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed at this time.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give a brief background to the NATO Training Centre project.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO Air Forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of Western Europe, with a concentration over West Germany. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recogizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an Integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked to submit their training requirements and, based on these statistics, an NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility to cater to all the training requirements. As the working group was instructed that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in a phase I report submitted to NATO in June 1983.

Two countries have offered potential sites for the centre: Goose Bay in Canada and Conia in Turkey. Site surveys were conducted of each site last year and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group. NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December 1988. During this phase, if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered then the alternate site would be considered. The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scope, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day or 20 two-week detachments each year; in other words, for 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties every two weeks by transport aircraft to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1,300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multinational base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three-year postings, many of them could be expected to bring their families. Thus, further swelling the population by a further 1,000 to 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operation centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer product stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities such as a parallel runway and a rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detail, design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say that, as currently envisioned, aircraft would partake in several training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance air combat training at medium to high altitude including supersonic flight, electronic warfare training using on-board and ground-based electronic equipment, practice weapons delivery, an optimum of four ranges is being considered; live weapons delivery, optimum three ranges; tactical air support of Maritime operations or anti-shipping, that would involve a sea range; and flag-type exercises involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles.

Several of these requirements are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes a sea range which is merely an area for aircraft to fire at targets towed by ships. Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States. Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. This no-drop bomb-scoring system has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits, which could accrue from such a project, are directly proportional to the scope of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full-scope optimum facility was examined, as defined in the Phase I Report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative and any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular operational phase. Of possible interest to communities other than Goose Bay-Happy Valley and its immediate neighbors, is the requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency or bad weather diversion. Goose Bay, being quite isolated, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the training scenario of the NATO training centre might require forward operating locations to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role. Both these alternate field roles would require some upgrading of local facilities such as runway extensions, refuelling capabilities and accommodations. Potential locations being considered by the NATO working group are Schefferville, Wabush and Churchill Falls. From the mention of these locations, incidentally, you may realize that the working group has centered its survey of Goose Bay's potential on the northern training area. The southern area would still likely see low level flying such as is currently conducted.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals, particularly with reference to the NATO Training Centre, are based on optimum facilities. All nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military programs are not exempt. As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and for the opportunity to address the interested public here in Schefferville today. I will be happy to answer any questions pertaining to my presentation at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. If you would be kind enough to stay seated where you are, I would invite anyone who wishes now, taking turns one at a time, of course, to put questions to Major McCabe concerning what the project is all about.

Would someone like to take the lead on this? I understood there might be some questions. Is there anyone seated at the side table, first of all, who would like to ask some questions?

I believe, then, there is a gentleman down there at the back of the room. Would you use one of those microphones, please? Make sure that the microphone is turned on and give your name, please?

M. GILLES POIRIER: Gilles Poirier, représentant de la Ville de Schefferville. J'aurais une question peut-être en trois (3) volets à vous adresser. Je voudrais savoir pour quelle raison est-ce que les autorités municipales n'ont pas été informées de la tenue de vos auditions aujourd'hui.

La première question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. If you will excuse me, I did not have the volume control on my receiver turned up to receive the translation. Would you please ask the question again?

M. GILLES POIRIER: My name is Gilles Poirier, I am a representative of the Town of Schefferville. Can I speak in English or French?

THE CHAIRMAN: In French, if you wish.

M. GILLES POIRIER: Gilles Poirier, représentant de la Ville de Shefferville. J'aurais une question peut-être en trois (3) volets à vous adresser. Je voudrais savoir pour quelle raison est-ce que les autorités municipales n'ont pas été informées de la tenue de vos auditions aujourd'hui.

La première question.

Je pourrais peut-être m'adresser ici à monsieur le président là.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would respond to that by saying that as early as the summer of this year, staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Office, who came into the community, met with many people and groups, including the local municipal councils. Those names were put on a mailing list, and since that time documentation concerning this review has been going out to every name on that list, including the offices of the municipal councils. This documentation included notices of meetings, giving locations and dates and times. That is my understanding of the situation, so I really do not understand why you have not received information. Could you just wait for a moment, please.

Thank you for waiting. It would appear that Mr. Dumont was sent the times and dates of the meetings, so I do not understand why the remainder of your Council were not advised.

M. GILLES POIRIER: We did not receive the notices and I understand the outfitters' businesses

were not informed, as I see no one is here.

THE CHAIRMAN: They were here this evening before the start of the meeting.

There has been some lack of communication. You were involved in the earlier meetings held with our staff, and, in effect, agreed to participate in these meetings to be held in Schefferville. I understand you were notified, so, beyond that, I am afraid I cannot explain what may have happened. But I understand that you will be present at tonight's session of the meeting.

M. GILLES POIRIER: Can the Town be present tonight?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course. The session starts at 7:00 o'clock tonight.

MONSIEUR GILLES POIRIER: L'autre partie de ma question s'adresserait à monsieur des Forces Armées. Est-ce qu'ils entendent nettoyer leurs déchets qui pourraient être laissés suite à leurs opérations militaires, de la même manière qu'ils ont laissé les déchets de la New Line il y a quelques années passées, dans le bois ici, des "tanks de fuel", des radars? Est-ce qu'ils entendent nettoyer, dans le futur, de la même manière qu'ils ont nettoyé dans le passé?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: In response to that question, obviously the way things were done in the past, many things, not only involving the military, were not done the way they should have been in the past. There is a program that is planned for clean-up of those DEW line sites and I think it has already started. I do not know many details of it but there is, as I say, a plan already in place to clean those up over a period of time. I believe they will be using, as much as possible, local people, local residents, to assist in that program. Apart from that, I really do not have any details on it, reference to any plans or development in Labrador, the sort of proposals we are talking about today. Quite obviously, any termination plans or any areas in the interior that were developed or used would have to include some kind of clean-up programs because that is one of the signs of the times nowadays, that government and government departments and even private industry are under different rules nowadays, much more stringent rules, and I can assure you that that would be the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe somebody over on that side -- yes, go ahead, sir.

MR. AURALIEN GILL: May I ask my question in French?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly, but would you please identify yourself, first?

MR. AURALIEN GILL: Auralien Gill, Indien montagnais, Pointe-Bleue, Lac St-Jean.

Je travaille avec le Conseil Attikamek Montagnais.

Monsieur le président, j'aimerais m'adresser au Major. J'aimerais savoir, d'abord, je ne suis pas très familier avec les audiences publiques des commissions. Est-ce que c'est la seule période que nous avons pour poser des questions au Major ou si on aura la chance de poser d'autres questions plus tard?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe I explained that this is the first round of meetings concerning this review. There will be at least one more series of meetings, perhaps two. I will explain that. Next year, perhaps in the late spring or early summer of 1987 when the Department of National Defence submits its Environmental Impact Statement, at that time it is quite possible that the Panel will hold another series of public information meetings. At that time Major McCabe or some other representative of the Department of National Defence would be present at those meetings to answer questions in the same way that he is now. The same thing would also apply in the fall of 1987 when the public hearings on the project will be held by the Panel.

MR. AURALIEN GILL: I think you explained that but I would like to know if it is possible tonight, for example, to ask questions of the Major.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I misunderstood. Tonight, yes, indeed, certainly. We would be going through the same sort of procedure again tonight because some different people will be here; for example, the town Council and the outfitters. So, we will be going through the same procedure again tonight.

M. AURALIEN GILL: Ma question, maintenant, évidemment, monsieur le président, s'adresserait au Major.

Nous savons que les manoeuvres militaires existent depuis déjà quelques années un peu partout au-dessus du territoire du Labrador, du Québec, de la Côte-Nord, de la région aussi du Lac St-Jean, à partir de la base de Bagotville, et caetera.

Nous savons aussi qu'il y a toutes sortes de choses en marche. Il y a évidemment, comme le Major l'a mentionné, des champs de tir qui sont en train d'être identifiés un peu partout.

Nous savons aussi qu'il y a des études qui se font maintenant depuis deux (2) ans ou trois (3) ans par la Défense nationale.

Il y en a une en particulier, je pense, qui est en train de se faire sur le suivi, en fait du déplacement des Indiens sur le territoire et le déplacement des chasseurs indiens sur la Côte-Nord, la Basse Côte-Nord et aussi probablement dans le Labrador.

Aussi, il y a des études je pense qui se font sur les animaux, comme on l'a expliqué tantôt sur le caribou, aussi j'imagine sur les oiseaux migrateurs, sur les animaux à fourrure, le castor, tout ça.

Moi, j'aimerais savoir du Major, d'abord comment se font ces études-là et quels en sont les résultats? Qu'est-ce qu'on peut... Parce qu'on n'a pas entendu parler de ces études-là. On n'a pas de résultat aucun de ces études-là.

Alors, je sais qu'on veut... peut-être la Défense nationale veut être transparente dans ses informations mais... Peut-être qu'il y en a eu beaucoup ou ce n'est pas venu à ma connaissance au niveau du Conseil Attikamek Montagnais, on n'a jamais eu de résultat d'étude.

Il y en a peut-être eu ailleurs, mais pas chez nous alors qu'on est directement concerné par les vols militaires et tout ce qui se fait actuellement concernant l'OTAN.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: In response to your question, first of all, I must make it clear that the studies that you are referring to are not organized by the Department of National Defence for the very reason that it is important that it is an independent study. There are two studies on-going right now. One is specifically examining the effects of low-flying military aircraft on caribou and we anticipate that will be completed this fall. An independent group has been hired by the Newfoundland Government. There is some federal money involved in that, a bit of sharing, but it is not a Department of National Defence study.

The other study that is also probably towards its completion phase is a study by the Canadian Public Health Association which, again, is an independent group and it is sponsored by the Provincial Government of Newfoundland, again nothing to do with the military. They are examining possible effects of military activity in general on the health and welfare of the people.

The reason you have not heard any results or conclusions is they are not finished. The Public Health Association study did publish an interim report which was released, I think, probably a month ago by now, somewhere around there. But, as I say, I do want to clarify that these are not military or not Department of National Defence sponsored studies. They affect our operation but it is important, as I say, that we stay out of it, if that answers your question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to add just a little to what the Major has said. Both of the studies that he has just mentioned were started before this Panel was appointed to conduct the public review. So, they are not really a part of this review although the results of those studies will be, of course, examined by this Panel and will be used by the Panel in considering what it should put into its report to the government at the end of the review. There may be some new studies, that will be necessary, as part of this review. When the Panel is ready to give its guidelines, its instructions to the Department of National Defence, it may be apparent in that document that some new studies are necessary. If so, the Department of National Defence will be responsible for arranging to have those studies done and for paying for the cost of those studies but, of course, those have not begun yet because we have not yet given that guidelines document to the Department.

Does all of that answer your question, sir?

MR. AURALIEN GILL: I have one question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, come ahead.

M. AURALIEN GILL: Monsieur le président, j'aimerais savoir d'abord si je dois poser ma question ou pas.

Est-ce que dans le mandat de la Commission, le mandat de la Commission veut faire une étude ou une consultation publique dans le but de minimiser l'impact des vols militaires? Est-ce que c'est ça? Ou encore, si la Commission a comme mandat de prendre le pouls du public et de voir si elle doit recommander que les vols militaires à basse altitude cessent ou uniquement d'essayer d'avoir l'opinion du public afin de minimiser l'impact des vols militaires.

En fait, je ne sais pas si je pose ma question clairement, c'est parce que si dans votre mandat, en fait ça dépend de votre mandat et j'aurais une question à poser au Major.

Je ne veux pas être à côté du sujet.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that your question is quite reasonable. Perhaps I can explain a little of what the mandate is.

There are two parts to the proposal, as I indicated earlier. There have been low level flights going on now for, I believe, five or six years or more. As a part of the proposal that has been given to the Minister of Environment, the Department of National Defence has stated that it is the intention of the Government of Canada to have those low level flights continue and it is expected that other NATO member countries might also become interested in carrying on this activity and would enter into what are called bilateral agreements with the Government of Canada to do the same sort of thing as the British and German Air Forces have been doing here for several years.

It is quite clear in the registered description of the project that that activity is intended to continue and it is not a part of the mandate of this Panel to recommend that that on-going activity, that present activity, be eliminated, be stopped. The Panel does have the power to recommend certain measures that might be taken to reduce the severity of any undesirable impacts that are occurring at the present time or, for that matter, to perhaps increase any beneficial effects that may be occurring from these on-going activities, but it does not have the power to recommend that they be stopped.

Now, with regard to the other part of the proposal, the proposal for the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for NATO to be based at Goose Bay, the situation is different. In that case, the Panel does have a mandate to recommend to the Government whether or not that Centre should be established and, if the Panel should decide at the end of this review that it wants to recommend that the Centre could be established without any undue impacts on the environment, then in that case the Panel would likely recommend, again, certain measures to be taken to minimize any unpleasant effects or to enhance any beneficial effects that might come out of the building and operation of such a training centre.

Does that make things clearer for you? You do not have a question any more; all right. Do you have any other questions you would like to ask? Fine, thank you very much.

Would anybody else like to ask a question of Major McCabe at this time? Could you please identify yourself?

MR. DENIS BRASSARD: My name is Denis Brassard, I work for the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais.

I would like, first, to know why the Panel did not get a mandate to evaluate the current low-flying activities; why? Secondly, I would like to recommend that the Panel gets the mandate to evaluate the current flights, so that it can take a decision of whether it is possible to go on or people are so affected by the flights that it should be all ceased as soon as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you misunderstood what I said earlier. The Panel does have a mandate to examine the on-going flying activities.

MR. DENIS BRASSARD: Yes, I do understand what you said.

THE CHAIRMAN: And to ask the public and anybody else whether those present activities are causing undesirable side effects and, if so, to recommend that certain changes be made. It is just that we have not been asked to recommend that they be stopped. To explain why that is not part of the mandate of the Panel, that mandate is contained in the terms of reference and the system is that those terms of reference are agreed upon between the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of the proponent department, which is National Defence in this case. So, I cannot answer as to why that item is not in the terms of reference, that is the way the terms of reference were given to the Panel by the Minister.

MR. DENIS BRASSARD: Yes, I do understand what you say, but what I am saying is that this is not enough to have power to get changes. What I want to say is that the low flying activities are surely not part of the National Defence policy; it is just a program administered by National Defence. So, as a program, it should be possible to stop it, if possible, and I recommend again that you get the mandate to stop it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Thank you very much for your recommendation. We will discuss it and the Panel can decide whether we wish to pursue that matter.

Would anybody else like to ask a question of Major McCabe at the present time about the nature of the project? Yes, sir. Would you please give your name before you ask your question?

MONSIEUR KAGUS: En Amérique du Sud, il y a des Américains qui travaillent lã pour l'OTAN. Puis lã, jusqu'ã date, les nègres qui travaillent lã-dedans, en Amérique du Sud, les Indiens qui sont lã, je ne sais pas qu'est-ce qu'ils font, mais les américains "run" tout lã-dedans.

Lã, moi, j'aimerais ça que vous me répondiez qu'est-ce que vous allez faire dans dix (10) ans ou quatre (4) ans après.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, I do not believe I completely understand what your question is. Would you ask it once more, please?

MONSIEUR KAGUS: Il y a des Indiens en Amérique du Sud, au Nicaragua, puis les Portoricains. Puis là, ce sont des Indiens qu'il y avait là-dedans, puis ce sont des Indiens reconnus, qui étaient des Indiens. Okay.

Là, les Américains sont arrivés, ils ont tout ramassé qu'est-ce qu'il y avait là-dedans.

Là, je me pose la question, est-ce que ça va être la même affaire pour nous autres ça?

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, would you care to try to respond to that question, please?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: First of all, obviously, I cannot comment on the military or political policies of other countries. What the Americans may or may not be doing in Central or South America has nothing to do with NATO. That is their own policy, it is not NATO. I can assure you that if the NATO project comes to Goose Bay, first of all, Canadians or a Canadian commander will be the overall control, if you like, of the base. Other countries would participate in various things. The Americans would have no more control over what went on there than anybody else would, they would have an input but they are totally separate things that you are talking about. I do not know if that helps.

MONSIEUR KAGUS: La question que je me pose, moi, l'OTAN c'est une organisation qui a été fondée en mil neuf cent quarante-cinq (1945), d'après des alliances qu'il y a eu concernant la guerre de quarante-cinq ('45).

En Allemagne, ils font tout ce qu'ils veulent; ils s'en vont pratiquer en Allemagne parce que les Allemands ne sont pas capables de se réveiller. Ils les contrôlent. Puis là, ils essaient de faire pareil sur nos territoires.

Puis là, je ne sais pas où les Américains se situent, ils ont des drapeaux partout.

La question que je veux savoir c'est s'ils vont faire pareil comme ils ont fait en Amérique du Sud ou en Allemagne.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think to add to what Major McCabe has already said, I would point out that part of what the Panel is trying to do in this review is to listen to anybody who cares to speak to the Panel when they talk to us about any bad affects that they might expect to come from this project. We want to listen to everybody and to hear about any possible bad affects on any resident of Labrador or Quebec who may be affected by this project. That, of course, includes the Native people. When we have heard all of the information, we will then sit down and write the report and, if there are concerns about some bad affects on some population or other, then we will have something to say about that in our report.

Major McCabe, did you want to have something else to say?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Just to reassure the gentleman that -- he is asking something about Americans and American involvement in the project proposal for Goose Bay. I can only repeat, the Americans will not have any particular input, as they have in other projects in the world which are their own programs, they are not NATO programs. Even some of the activity of Americans in Europe at bases there is not necessarily NATO. The project in Goose Bay really is not going to have any American control, if you like. So, I would not be too concerned about similarities between policies in Central or South America and what would occur in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. Are there any other questions for the Major concerning the nature of the project? Yes, sir, come ahead.

MR. AURALIEN GILL: I have a question for Major McCabe.

You talked in your presentation about the existence of a military co-ordinating committee, something like that, and since 1984 that committee was monitoring the presence of localization, I guess, of the caribou herds in Native campsites. Could you give me the results of this monitoring activity?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: The Military Co-ordination Centre is not a committee, it is the equivalent of what another base would be called, a base operation centre. It is a co-ordination centre for flying, it is not a monitoring body, if you like, specifically for monitoring caribou or anything like that. Its purpose is to — through reports that are received about, for example, caribou migrations or information that is passed in in reference to camps that are being occupied, be they Native or outfitters or anybody else, it is not just Native, as they get that information they immediately ensure that the air crews that are flying in the area at the time, before they go off, their maps are amended to indicate those areas as a no-fly area, if you like. That is its purpose.

Since the inception of that Co-ordination

Centre, the number of over-flight reports, if you like, particularly of camps because that is where we get feedback from, has reduced dramatically. So, I could suggest that the Centre has been successful to date. It could be better, but that depends on information we get on the occupation of camps, et cetera.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Major McCabe? Yes, sir, down at the back. Would you please give your name before you ask your question?

M. JEAN-BAPTIST LAURENT: Est-ce qu'il y a moyen de traduire en montagnais, je vais parler en montagnais. Je ne sais pas si vous allez comprendre en avant. Oui? Okay. (Speaks Montagnais).

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I am not sure if I understand if that was a question or whether the gentleman is asking for the opportunity to speak, Mr. Chairman. I did not understand the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did get a translation of the last part of what you said. I apologize, the system made me miss the first part of it. Would you please ask your question again? Is it a question to Major McCabe?

M. JEAN-BAPTIST LAURENT: Regardez là, je voudrais savoir comment nos vieux pensent justement de ce qui se passe au point de vue faune, au point de vue écologie puis peut-être que s'ils pouvaient émettre leur opinion face à la situation actuelle point de vue faune et flore. (Speaks Montagnais).

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. I was, in fact, about to say that I understand that the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais has arranged for a number of speakers to speak to us here this afternoon. Before we do that, I think that we might all enjoy a very short break. I would ask that we keep it to five minutes, please, because I know there are several speakers who wish to speak to us. So, if we could now take a break of five minutes and, when we come back, we will hear from the Montagnais people. Thank you very much.

---Short Recess

Tape 8

---Upon Resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: As I said before the break, I believe that the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais has arranged for some speakers. So, at this time I would like to turn the floor temporarily over to Mr. Mollen, who, I understand, is going to introduce the speakers as they appear. Mr. Mollen?

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais).

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, sir, we have a problem with interpretation. Would you wait for a moment until we get the problem cleared up.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces Pauline Vollant.)

—-SOUMISSION PAR MADAME PAULINE VOLLANT:

MADAME PAULINE VOLLANT: La communauté montagnaise de Schefferville désire d'abord souhaiter la bienvenue aux membres de la Commission d'évaluation environnementale et aux autres visiteurs concernés par l'avenir de notre communauté.

On a été si souvent mis de côté et laissé à notre propre sort lorsque les gouvernements et les grandes compagnies venaient imposer leurs développements, que de voir autant de monde réuni ici aujourd'hui nous donne confiance.

Nous espérons ainsi que la Commission tiendra compte de nos préoccupations face aux manoeuvres aériennes militaires et que les décisions qui seront prises assureront aux Montagnais un avenir meilleur.

Mon intervention comprend trois (3) parties principales. La première concerne la situation socio-économique de la communauté, la deuxième parle des différents projets de développement que la communauté veut entreprendre et la troisième établit la position de la communauté montagnaise face aux manoeuvres aériennes militaires.

Situation socio-économique.

Il y a à peine quarante (40) ans, tout ce qui vous entoure aujourd'hui comme les maisons et les infrastructures de transport n'existaient pas.

Soumission, P. Vollant

Schefferville n'existait pas. Tout le territoire n'était habité et utilisé que par les Indiens. Nos parents et nos grands-parents, après nos ancêtres, y vivaient en paix depuis des temps immémoriaux.

Ils pouvaient pratiquer leurs activités traditionnelles de chasse, pêche, trappe et cueillette sans crainte d'être dérangés, ennuyés ou même harassés. Ils avaient leurs problèmes, c'est certain, mais au moins, ils étaient maîtres de leur propre sort.

Les vrais problèmes des Montagnais ont commencé avec l'établissement de la mine et la création de la ville.

Tant qu'ils ont été utiles aux explorateurs et aux prospecteurs, les Montagnais ont pu bénéficier d'une certaine compréhension de la part des non-Indiens.

La main-d'oeuvre montagnaise a ensuite travaillé à l'exploitation de la mine et à la construction de la ville parce que cela leur assurait quelques revenus supplémentaires, mais déjà on les obligeait à se plier à des valeurs et à des habitudes qui leur sont étrangères.

La compagnie minière avait besoin de main-d'oeuvre et elle tentait par tous les moyens de transformer les Montagnais en employés stables à plein temps, sans tenir compte de leur mode de vie et de leurs aspirations.

Avec des salaires intéressants pour l'époque et l'endroit, la compagnie minière exerçait une espèce de chantage pour obliger les travailleurs montagnais à s'astreindre à ses exigences de travail.

C'est ainsi que, dès les années cinquante ('50), une quarantaine de familles s'étaient établies sur le site actuel de la ville, plus exactement là où se situe la piste d'atterrissage de l'aéroport.

Le développement de la ville et l'augmentation des travailleurs non-Indiens ont accentué la dépendance des familles montagnaises et leur aliénation du territoire traditionnel.

Les Montagnais ont dû se battre pour résister aux différentes tentatives de relocalisation, parce que d'un endroit à l'autre, ils finissaient toujours par nuire aux développements en cours.

Sans compétence valable pour se défendre, les Montagnais n'étaient désormaix plus chez eux. Ils étaient devenus, en grande partie, inutiles et nuisibles et le ministère des Affaires indiennes exerça des pressions pour que les familles présentes se dispersent vers d'autres réserves indiennes.

Environ trois cents (300) personnes ont cependant pris la décision de rester, alors qu'ils étaient plus de cinq cents (500) vers le milieu des années cinquante ('50).

Au cours des années suivantes, la situation socio-économique des Montagnais de Schefferville est caractérisée par une alternance en grande partie saisonnière, d'une part, du travail salarié à la mine, chez des entrepreneurs locaux ou pour le ministère des Affaires indiennes. Et d'autre part, des activités traditionnelles en forêt.

Le nombre de Montagnais employés à la mine a baissé progressivement. En mil neuf cent cinquante-sept (1957), ils étaient une trentaine et en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-un (1981), ils n'étaient plus que sept (7), la plupart permanents.

La fermeture de la mine et de la ville ont reserré encore davantage, on s'en doute, les possibilités d'emploi pour les Montagnais. On se retrouve donc aujourd'hui avec une population montagnaise de cinq cent seize (516) personnes, dont environ soixante et cinq pour cent (65%) ont moins de vingt-cinq (25) ans.

Le conseil de bande fournit la majorité des emplois disponibles, mais plus de soixante et quinze pour cent (75%) de la population montagnaise dépend, à un moment ou l'autre, des prestations de l'aide sociale.

L'école a aussi contribué à déstabiliser le mode de vie familial en forêt, quoique les activités de chasse, pêche et trappe sont encore pratiquées par la majorité des Montagnais. La pratique de ces activités a changé au cours des années, mais les récoltes fauniques saisonnières, en particulier le caribou, assurent toujours l'alimentation de base des familles.

Ces récoltes fauniques constituent un apport économique important pour les Montagnais. D'autant plus que le marché du travail s'est à peu près fermé complètement depuis mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-trois (1983).

La croissance des troupeaux de caribou ces dernières années apparaît l'un des principaux débouchés économiques restant pour la communauté montagnaise.

Les projets de la communauté.

Pour assurer l'avenir de leur communauté, les Montagnais de Schefferville ont l'intention de mettre en oeuvre différents projets de développement économique. La base de ce développement économique est le caribou et les territoires de chasse traditionnels. Voici un bref résumé des principaux projets en préparation.

Il y a d'abord tout le domaine des

pourvoiries, de guidage et des services pour la chasse et la pêche.

Le Conseil de bande veut encourager les chasseurs montagnais à organiser des mini pourvoiries sur leurs propres territoires de chasse.

Les revenus ainsi réalisés pourraient constituer un apport saisonnier aux revenus des familles.

Le Conseil de bande maintiendrait un bureau central à Schefferville pour assurer la coordination des activités. Les Montagnais ont aussi l'intention de récupérer les installations des pourvoiries actuelles opérant sur les territoires de chasse traditionnels.

Les Montagnais ont aussi un projet de développement axé sur la chasse communautaire du caribou. Le ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche du Québec a d'ailleurs accepté le principe du contrôle de cette chasse par le Conseil de bande qui émettrait lui-même le permis de chasse au caribou.

L'idée du projet de chasse communautaire n'est pas de commercialiser la viande de caribou en vue de faire des profits. Il s'agit plutôt de favoriser la récolte de caribou en nombre suffisant pour répondre aux besoins des autres communautés montagnaises, tout en assurant la conservation des troupeaux.

Les peaux de caribou récupérées par les chasseurs pourront être transformées localement dans une tannerie contrôlée par la communauté. Ce projet de tannerie s'inscrit aussi dans les initiatives de développement économique qu'entend mettre de l'avant le Conseil de bande.

Une fois transformées, les peaux de caribou vont servir au développement de l'artisanat local, actuellement pratiqué sur des bases individuelles.

Il s'agirait d'établir un comptoir d'artisanat où tous les artisans et artisanes pourraient écouler leurs produits. Le marché de la vente d'artisanat étant plutôt restreint à Schefferville, le Conseil de bande entend prendre tous les moyens pour favoriser le marketing des produits dans les grands centres urbains.

Il y a aussi un projet de vente de panaches qui est en train de s'organiser.

L'an dernier, un projet pilote a été mis sur pied pour examiner les possibilités. Les résultats ont été encourageants. Les panaches sont utilisés pour la fabrication d'une poudre ayant des propriétés spéciales, particulièrement recherchées dans certains pays étrangers.

Tous ces projets, en plus des activités de chasse, de pêche et de trappe qui se poursuivent, ont pour but d'améliorer la situation socio-économique des familles montagnaises de Schefferville et, en bout de ligne, d'assurer une plus grande autonomie financière pour la communauté.

Les territoires de chasse et le caribou sont au centre de ces projets de développement économique et toute activité militaire risque fortement de compromettre les efforts à cet égard.

Position de la communauté face aux manoeuvres aériennes militaires.

Le représentant du ministère de la Défense nationale est venu nous parler d'un projet important pour les Montagnais.

Ce projet est important pour nous parce qu'il risque de gravement compromettre les projets de développement économique que veut entreprendre la communauté montagnaise de Schefferville sur ses territoires traditionnels.

Nous avions entendu parler des manoeuvres aériennes militaires sur la Basse Côte-Nord, mais maintenant, nous sommes certains que ce projet de vols militaires sur nos territoires de chasse va entraîner de nombreux problèmes pour les Montagnais.

Pour assurer son avenir, notre communauté ne peut se permettre de miser sur les belles paroles du représentant de la Défense nationale.

Le projet qu'il nous a décrit présente trop de risques pour nos territoires et pour notre population. Il s'agit non seulement de risques pour nos projets de développement économique, dont nous avons tant besoin, mais dans les faits, c'est tout notre mode de vie qui est en péril avec ces manoeuvres aériennes militaires.

Les familles montagnaises qui vivent en forêt ne connaissent rien de ces vols militaires en rase-motte; comment pensez-vous qu'elles vont réagir, en particulier les enfants, les femmes et les vieillards, lorsque ces avions militaires vont raser la cîme des arbres ou les surprendre pendant les déplacements en canot?

Vont-ils apprécier la présence de ces visiteurs imprévisibles et bruyants? J'en doute beaucoup.

Et les animaux qui nous nourrissent, la perdrix, le lièvre, les poissons et surtout le caribou; de quelle façon vont-ils réagir au bruit et à la fumée de vos avions de guerre?

Nous, les Montagnais, vivons sur ces territoires depuis très longtemps et c'est parce que nos pères et nos mères ont pris soin des animaux, de la terre et de l'eau que nous sommes ici aujourd'hui.

Ce serait une traîtrise énorme envers nos ancêtres que de permettre à ces avions de circuler. Ce serait aussi faire preuve d'une grande irresponsabilité envers nos enfants et les enfants de nos enfants que d'abandonner nos territoires aux activités des militaires.

Qu'arrivera-t-il en cas d'accident? Y avez-vous pensé?

Vous avez prévu des mesures pour réduire les risques, mais il y a toujours l'imprévisible, des événements que vous minimisez ou que vous ne voulez pas discuter en public.

Il y a, par exemple, la possibilité qu'un avion s'écrase en pleine forêt, déclenche un incendie; qu'une personne apeurée par le passage des avions se noie ou provoque un accident fatal; qu'une erreur de vos pilotes entraîne des conséquences désastreuses pour la faune ou les campements des familles montagnaises.

Vous allez me dire qu'il s'agit simplement de s'entendre sur les endroits sensibles pour la faune ou utilisés comme site de campement, mais, malheureusement, ce n'est pas aussi simple que cela.

Les animaux se déplacent à leur guise, de différentes façons, et les familles montagnaises doivent en faire autant si elles veulent s'en nourrir.

Les chasseurs ont souvent à parcourir de grandes distances, loin d'un site de campement, pour chasser ou trapper. Un site de campement approprié pour une saison ou une année peut s'avérer inadéquat pour une saison ou pour l'année suivante.

Il faut donc que vous compreniez que les familles montagnaises se déplacent partout sur les territoires et qu'il n'y a aucune région qui peut être identifiée comme inutilisée à un moment ou à un autre.

La situation que je viens de vous décrire concerne les dangers que risquent les Montagnais en forêt, mais le projet de la Défense nationale implique également le site de Schefferville.

En effet, l'établissement d'un centre d'entraînement tactique de l'OTAN à Goose Bay nécessite l'utilisation de pistes d'avion satellite en cas de problème pour les pilotes.

Dans une réunion tenue le vingt-sept (27) janvier mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six (1986) et réunissant des militaires, des gens des Affaires indiennes et d'autres fonctionnaires, il fut mentionné que le projet de base de l'OTAN à Goose Bay impliquerait un réaménagement et une expansion de l'aéroport de Schefferville.

> "The project will also affect airfields at Schefferville, Churchill Falls and Wabush which will be expanded to have satellite airfield capabilities."

Nous savons également que le ministère des Affaires indiennes et le ministère des Transports du Canada sont en pourparlers concernant la réfection de la piste d'atterrissage.

L'aéroport va demeurer ouvert, mais la piste doit être refaite d'ici deux (2) ans.

Différentes options sont discutées, soit de raccourcir la piste, de la garder de la même longueur, de l'aménager en gravel ou de l'asphalter.

J'aimerais bien savoir s'il y a un lien entre le projet de la Défense nationale et celui de rénover la piste d'atterrissage. Pour quelles utilisations la piste sera-t-elle rénovée? Quels seront les impacts sur la communauté montagnaise de Schefferville?

Toutes ces questions demeurent actuellement sans réponse et c'est pourquoi nous nous

6

opposons fortement aux manoeuvres aériennes militaires et au projet de base de l'OTAN à Goose Bay.

Notre survie et notre développement économique reposent entièrement sur les territoires traditionnels et en particulier sur la présence du caribou. Toute atteinte à l'intégrité de nos territoires risque de détruire tous nos efforts pour s'assurer un avenir meilleur.

Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Do you wish Major McCabe to respond to any of your questions right now or will you be satisfied to see them answered in the Environmental Impact Statement?

MADAME PAULINE VOLLANT: (Indicates no).

THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, then, would you please go on to the next speaker, whenever you are ready?

MR. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces George Gabriel).

---SUBMISSION BY GEORGE GABRIEL:

It is as if you heard somebody shooting guns, large cannons. For the caribou, of course, it bothers them to no end, particularly in the canoe we feel it and it is bad for the fish, too. All the animals are affected by this, particularly when I went in the bush. I can tell you that I do not want these things to come any more but to see them so low means that we cannot go on the water with our canoes any more. We are afraid that they will capsize.

We have even noted that even berries are not growing. Everything is affected, so that the caribou meat is affected, too. I have been on the land for a long, long time. It is the first time that I see the caribou so frightened.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: Je demanderais

à Joe MacKenzie de venir nous parler aussi, je pense, de la situation actuelle qu'ils vivent sur le territoire.

---SUBMISSION BY JOE MACKENZIE:

I am Joe MacKenzie.
I have been here for 60 years on these hunting grounds, even before I even got married. I also want to speak like the fellow that preceded me with respect to these planes that fly low. They disturb the animals to no end. Just the fact of the emissions from the planes, they affect the berries that are being eaten and the other food that the caribou eat. We have noted that the caribou meat is not normal any more. That is what I think.

For a long time our parents and grandparents were doing the same thing. We were living the same kind of life. I was raised on the land with my father, the way our grandparents have raised us and educated us. Now, with these planes that fly so low, this is affecting our lifestyle. I cannot say any more. Other people will speak for me.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces Madame Assini).

MADAME ASSINI: (Speaks Montagnais.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, but I am not getting a translation. Would wait a moment to see if we can solve the problem. I wonder if you would mind beginning again, please? I am very sorry.

MR. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: She will begin again.

---SUBMISSION BY MADAME ASSINI:

All the remedies have been destroyed, as well as all the berries, the red berries, because in the wintertime even the Montagnais would remove the snow in order to find these herbs that we used for our remedies and we still are using these natural remedies. We find that our food, our caribou meat, is being destroyed as well.

We have already seen what is going to happen. The animals which are affected, and their very meat is affected. Before there were no doctors, we only saw him once a year, and we had to heal ourselves. We could cure anything with the harvest of herbs that we found in the woods. Of course, this is restricting us now because the detrimental effect on the animals is certain affecting us and it is those planes which are destroying the nature where we used to find our remedies.

We used the canoe when we had our parents and our grandparents, our uncles. We were real Innu, real Montagnais, because we did not use any strange products. When we went up into the woods we only came back in December. We knew only about a little bit of salt and we used a little bit of flour, that was all, because our meat and our food was the beaver and the caribou and the fish and we spent all year out in the hunting grounds. We also took care of ourselves with our remedies which we found out in the woods. With all our different maladies that we knew about, we could cure them ourselves. All the elders here will remember that. Some here are even older than I am.

That is what I had to say but I am really very sorry to see that we can destroy what is being destroyed. That is to say, the food of my children and my great grandchildren. I have four grandchildren, their father is dead now, and when we went hunting lately we tried to find everything we could for our own food. Presently it is our grandchildren who will take us inland to the woods. What will become of them when they all get older and their grandchildren, what will happen to them?

That is all I can say.

MR. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces Joseph Jean-Pierre.)

---SUBMISSION BY JOSEPH JEAN-PIERRE:

I can only say a very few things. My name is Joseph Jean-Pierre, my age is 77.

If we go a few miles inland around Schefferville -- that is where I live -- as soon as I was able to move I went to the land and I always loved it. I still go to the woods now. What I want is someone who will let the caribou come close to us here in

Schefferville. This is a benefit because it is our food. Right now we notice the disappearance of animals and fish and, when we hunt beaver and other animals, we are very well off. I repeat that I like to be on the land, even if I do not harvest any meat.

From Lapointe, which can be seen from Schefferville -- that is where I came from -- there was a truck that brought goods and vegetables since they destroyed the territories in this environment here. That is where the animals breed and we pushed them back further. That is a lot of fur that is gone for us. It is as if my money were being taken right out of my pocket. They promised us 130 years of work when they came to Schefferville and now they are gone. That is what I do not like about the way things are going today, the Iron Ore Company is gone. What went wrong? Why could it not keep up its work here in Schefferville, this mining work?

Regarding military aircraft, personally I have not had a chance to hear or see them, but I must go back to the land and do something about it.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: Now we will invite Mathieu André who will speak to us.

---SUBMISSION BY MATHIEU ANDRÉ:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I heard everything that was said this afternoon by the Defence Department and the information department and I think it might be a good thing for them to get into their work. It might be a

Sub., Andre

good idea for us in the future if there ever was to be a war but there is something that is not so good. It is that Trudeau did not consult the Montagnais on this type of development that was going to be carried on here. If he had consulted the Montagnais and the Indians of Goose Bay and the North West River and Davis Inlet, perhaps there would have been more discussion and they could have found other grounds for these exercises.

I know the territory, which is the Arctic, but I do not know who owns the Arctic. In wartime, I think that there was radar or antennas in these places but who owned these radar antennas? If we had consulted with the Montagnais they would have known how to deal with these problems because the best land is the land that we are on right now, it is the land included between Goose Bay, Natashquan, Davis Inlet. I also saw land at Fort Chimo and further up. The land spreads over 200 miles with Goose Bay is right in the middle of it and another 170 miles the other way. That is where the best land is, where the wildlife is the most abundant, fur-bearing animals. These are the best, most beautiful fur-bearing animals that you can find in Labrador. I know that in the Quebec region fur is of a lower quality. It is because what we have here is the richest land for us. That means from Natashquan, Goose Bay and going westward as far as Longueuil Point.

I had a chance to meet with Inuit when I

Sub., Andre

went across this territory at least seven times. I had a chance to work there and I had a chance to go there three times for other reasons. It was for the store that was set up in Fort Chimo. That was back in 1915, another time in 1918 and the last time, more recently. In the Ungava area I had a chance to work for a geologist and that was when I had a chance to note the quality of that land.

Now, from Goose Bay and about 240 miles to the north, it is another type of land. In the north it is mainly fish that makes up their wealth. There is salmon and there is also fox and seals. I am talking about the Inuit now. That is also where the white partridge breeds. There is game, there are ducks. That is the wealth of the Inuit.

In this middle of this land, at Goose Bay and at Schefferville, as well as in the Ungava region, it is caribou, because caribou are countless. They have been there for a long time. They have been there so long, that we think of our grandparents who lived there and lived off the caribou that migrate within these regions. I am presently talking about the territories that are a natural wealth for us.

There is also, as you know, other wealth such as iron, iron ore. That is about a 70 mile span. Then I talked to you about what I saw up at Natashquan and, perhaps, 70 miles northeast of Natashquan. I saw this land to the north of Mingan, Pointe-Bleue, Nitassinan, I saw all the land of the

Sub., Andre

other Inuit The way I am talking to you about this land that is wealth for us, we see that we are going to lose all this land that belongs to us. We used to have our own government and we took care of ourselves because I know that my father, my grandfather never had any help from the government in any way, shape or form. That is why I am sorry about the fact that Trudeau in no way consulted our people before handing over this land, when this is the wealthiest land.

I know I am going to tell you what the impact is on the animals. I will start with caribou. On the Kanaaupscow River, almost at the estuary, that is where the caribou leaves from and the caribou and its migration goes as far as just about 60 miles from Goose Bay. Why does it not go any further? It is because there is no more food further on. What happens right now and what happened before you came was that to the west or in the Kanaaupscow region, all their food was flooded with water. Whatever remains as food for caribou, such a lichen, is to the north of Fort Chimo and in the part of the land west of Goose Bay. The airplanes are destroying this food, without mentioning the 80 rivers that the government expects to dam up, and now the lichen that the caribou feed on will be burnt by gases. What will happen to the caribou now is that they will no longer know where to go because they will have no food left. I know that the caribou cannot cross the boundaries that I told you about because there is no food beyond them any more.

Sub., Andre

We can say now that, if the food is destroyed, it will not be able to go anywhere else. It will starve to death right there, it will fall ill. The lichen that the caribou feed on is not entirely edible. There is only a part of the lichen that is edible.

There is another plant that the caribou feeds on and the head of this plant resembles lichen but it cannot eat the bottom part of that plant. That is why caribou consume a huge amount of these plants, because it cannot eat the whole plant. That is what I see right now as damage that could be caused to the caribou herds by destroying their food. That is why I say that airplanes will affect these herds.

Before seeing these planes we could still eat caribou liver and now we can no longer eat caribou liver. If we look at the innkeepers in Labrador who fly over these herds in helicopters at 50 feet altitude to turn them away from their migration paths, this also affects them, and we see that the herd is sick today. We just have to take a look at their liver. Caribou liver is shrinking in size, as well as the kidneys of the caribou. That is how caribou is affected.

Let us say we eat caribou as it is now; do you not think that we also might fall sick? If we look at other animals with the exhaust gases of the planes that will fall on these animals on the earth, everthing is bad. Fish, water, leaves, branches,

Sub., Andre

every describable thing is being affected by this exhaust smoke from these airplanes, as well as the flies. They are killed by the exhaust. They fall into the water, the fish eat these flies and get sick. All I can say is that I have seen it with my own eyes.

I saw the insecticide. I saw airplanes spraying insecticide and that affected not only the flies but also the fish eating these flies. Another animal, which is a fur-bearing one, the fieldmouse, will be affected by this gas. Predatory animals eating these fieldmice will get sick from eating them and, if we talk about otters that feed on fish, the poisoned fish will also affect the otter, as well as birds that feed on worms and small insects. These small insects or these worms are poisoned and make the birds sick.

I am not a doctor but I know this, with my age of 83 years. I know that some here are as old as I am and they know, too, and they have seen that before there used to be many birds, small and large birds. There are not any more now. What killed them off is the gas in the air and the insecticide.

I know that in the Quebec region we use this insecticide to kill worms, but birds eat these worms, so their food is poisoned. Thinking over my experience, I think my experience tells me that this is the way things were in the past and the way things are today. What I am afraid of when I hear talk of military airplanes flying over our territory is

Sub., Andre

anything that might destroy or poison and everything that we are going to do here to develop on a military plane will bring about the destruction of our resources. I know that there is peat moss sold either in France or England and, if we poison the land here, what will these people live off of, because not only Montagnais but also whites will be economically affected.

Something else besides this. I think that the government does not do enough thinking. When we are concerned with building many dams -- if the government decides to build 10 dams, does the government anticipate or think that these dams will never break? Imagine the damage that would cause; the impact of a dam burst. If you look at the land on the riverbanks, if ever a dam were to break, how many people would die. With the number of dams that the government expects to develop, it is going to be the first target in wartime for enemy armies and we will all be destroyed.

I think that the government is not doing enough thinking, is not looking closely enough into the future. I think that the government does not even think of its grandchildren. This is my viewpoint on pollution and the destruction of our lands. It is really hard to destroy something that has been built or implemented by Trudeau, even contracts and agreements that have intervened, without affecting the Innu people.

Sub., Andre

I know that the Canadian government is not alone, other governments are playing their roles, too. For us it is as if it were nothing to suffer these wars as compared to the masses that will be involved in the world war. Perhaps if we had been consulted we would have found other places favourable for this kind of development.

That is what I see as a negative impact for our grandchildren with the thousands of years of use of the land by our people. All these people will be poisoned, it is not only the Innu people. I know that there are people who come to fish, foreigners who come here to fish or to hunt caribou and, if these animals are poisoned, they will also be poisoned.

Everyone wants to live, everyone wants to meet his own needs. It is like the farmer who takes great care of his plants and his grains and seeds. He takes great care to water his plants and to harvest at the right time. For us things go the same way. If we are talking about gamekeepers, we used to have our own gamekeepers, our parents and our grandparents. We took great care to kill or to harvest animals according to our needs because we did not have any freezers at that time. We only needed the needful and we only killed animals when necessary. Also, for those in need, trappers or hunters, who were in the vicinity and the families in the vicinity because it was to share with the families that were

Sub., Andre

around. We were only there for a month at the mouth of the river and the rest of the time we would spend inland, maybe even up to 450 miles inland, and this is where there are connections to go either toward the west or toward the north or toward the east or towards the North West River. These connections are ways to reach other lands because there are also some who left from Saint-Augustin, Natashquan. Those from Natashquan and Saint-Augustin, also could come as far as this place to hunt caribou. This is a huge distance.

Some people did not come down the mouth of the rivers, they would stay inland all year round to live off the caribou. I am talking about the George River. That is why I say that these lands, where we have been for a long time, are the best lands and they served as an access to other lands. I am not misleading you, I could have told you how you could kill a caribou with a blade. I tell no lies. I know that some people here know of this and they know I have travelled and crossed these lands, how I went to Goose Bay. That is how I know the area.

For my part, what I regret is that you are falling right into the middle of the best lands between Goose Bay and Nitassinan to the west. That is why it is regrettable when we think of all the animals which are poisoned and destroyed; the caribou, small game, even flies and mosquitos poisoned by exhaust gases. You know what I am talking about,

Sub., Andre

you know that exhaust gases kill.

Now, I want to thank you for having allowed me to speak. I am not strong enough to prevent you from doing what you want to do but I can only hope that you will not go too far, that you will not further destroy these resources. At least if there would only be an area of 200 miles where you would limit these activities. I fear for our grandchildren and our great grandchildren. What will they have, what will be their legacy? That is why I am speaking in these terms. It is of no importance to me for now, maybe tomorrow I will die. That is why I wanted to tell you all I saw and all I know.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Mr. Mollen, could I ask you if you have very many more speakers planned for this session, because it is now nearly 5:15. We are supposed to begin again at 7:00 o'clock tonight, when I know there are some other speakers who wish to appear before us. I am willing to give you a little more time, if you have some more speakers, right now.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces Camil Vollant).

---SOUMISSION PAR MONSIEUR CAMIL VOLLANT:

M. CAMIL VOLLANT: Camil Vollant, vice-président du Conseil Attikamek Montagnais.

Mon intervention ne sera pas extrêmement longue, monsieur le président; ça va vous permettre de vous reposer un peu et probablement d'ouvrir l'esprit en même temps que le ventre.

Nous avons déjà fait part, lors des audiences à La Romaine de la position du CAM et nous avions, à l'époque, insisté sur des aspects psychologiques et sur le dérangement culturel que le projet... que les vols militaires et le projet de Goose Bay pourraient entraîner au sein de la communauté montagnaise.

Afin d'être au même diapason que les promoteurs du projet, ainsi que sur l'ensemble de la société canadienne, quant à ce point de vue sur le projet, je vais vous parler davantage maintenant de l'impact des manoeuvres aériennes sur le développement économique des communautés concernées.

Parmi les nombreuses objections qui motivent l'opposition du CAM au projet, je vais m'attarder plus particulièrement sur l'impact des activités militaires sur le développement économique des communautés montagnaises concernées par ces activités.

Depuis les premiers contacts avec les

non-Indiens et surtout depuis la création des réserves indiennes, l'histoire démontre amplement que les Montagnais n'ont jamais eu la liberté de poursuivre les activités économiques nécessaires au développement de leurs communautés.

L'histoire des Montagnais n'est en effet qu'une suite de contraintes et de fausses promesses imposées par les gouvernements.

On a qu'à constater la situation actuelle des réserves indiennes pour constater à quel point les communautés ont été transformées en ghettos et écartées du développement économique environnant.

Avec le taux de chômage sur les réserves et le niveau de dépendance économique envers les gouvernements, on voit finalement que c'est toute la société montagnaises qui subit les conséquences du sous-développement. En d'autres termes, on voit que ce sont les non-Indiens et les gouvernements qui s'enrichissent aux dépends des Montagnais.

Les richesses des territoires montagnais ont été exploitées et même surexploitées, sans penser aux conséquences néfastes pour l'environnement et pour les familles montagnaises qui dépendent de ces territoires pour leur existence.

Quand les lacs et les rivières sont vides de poisson, que les forêts sont décimées par les coupes à blanc - il n'y a pas de connotation raciste là-dessus - que les territoires de chasse sont inondés par les barrages ou que les mines, comme ici à Schefferville, sont abandonnées parce qu'elles ne sont plus rentables, c'est toujours aux Montagnais de s'arranger avec les restes et avec les conséquences des activités des non-Indiens.

Et, malheureusement, tout ça n'est pas fini. Aujourd'hui, c'est au tour des vols militaires de venir menacer les activités économiques des Montagnais.

Il semble que pour se faire comprendre, on ne répètera jamais assez l'importance économique des activités de chasse, de pêche, de trappe des familles montagnaises. Ce sont des activités économiques traditionnelles qui contribuent à l'année longue et de façon substantielle aux revenus des familles.

Ce sont des activités économiques légitimes, parties intégrantes d'un mode de vie et d'une culture ancestrale, sans compter leur importance économique dans une région où les emplois et le marché du travail sont plutôt restreints.

Si on examine la situation socio-économique des quatre (4) communautés montagnaises de la Moyenne et Basse Côte-Nord par exemple, on constate rapidement à quel point ces communautés font face à des difficultés grandissantes en termes de revenus et d'activités.

Le nombre de personnes âgées de moins de vingt-cinq (25) ans représente, en moyenne, soixante-deux pour cent (62%) de la population totale dans ces communautés en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-deux (1982).

La population montagnaise peut être ainsi considérée comme jeune, étant donné l'importance de ce groupe d'âge par rapport à la population totale.

Ces jeunes veulent travailler, aspirent à des emplois et tiennent à poursuivre les activités traditionnelles de leurs ancêtres. Or, la présence et l'accroissement des manoeuvres aériennes militaires font obstacle au développement de ces différentes activités économiques chez les Montagnais.

Une étude sur les revenus de ces quatre (4) communautés montagnaises réalisée pour l'année quatre-vingt-trois ('83), quatre-vingt-quatre ('84), a démontré l'importance économique des activités de chasse, de pêche, trappe et cueillette pour les familles montagnaises.

L'étude indique que les revenus de

récolte faunique représentent le tiers des revenus de salaire, si l'on assigne une valeur monétaire aux récoltes de mammifères, d'oiseaux, d'oeufs, de poissons et d'invertébrés.

Dans une communauté comme Saint-Augustin par exemple, la valeur monétaire des activités de récolte faunique est même supérieure à celle des revenus de salaires.

Sans ces activités de récolte, actuellement menacées par les manoeuvres aériennes militaires, l'économie des communautés montagnaises risque de prendre un coup dur.

Les emplois créés à Goose Bay seront peut-être avantageux pour les résidents non-indiens, mais ils se traduiront inévitablement par des pertes de revenus et de travail pour les Montagnais de la Moyenne et Basse Côte-Nord et de Schefferville.

En quatre-vingt-trois ('83), quatre-vingt-quatre ('84), les paiements de transfert représentent en moyenne soixante pour cent (60%) des revenus totaux dans ces communautés. Le taux d'aide sociale atteint vingt-trois pour cent (23%) de la population, alors qu'il se situe à environ huit pour cent (8%) de la population non-indienne sur la Côte-Nord.

Le salaire moyen par semaine s'élève

deux cent quatorze dollars (214,00$) chez les Montagnais contre quatre cent soixante et dix (470,00) chez les non-indiens de la Côte-Nord.

Ces quelques statistiques sur les revenus démontrent à quel point la situation économique des communautés montagnaises est précaire, malgré l'apport substantiel des activités de récolte faunique dans le budget des familles.

Toute diminution de récolte animale pourrait ainsi entraîner des conséquences désastreuses pour les familles montagnaises.

De plus, les communautés montagnaises travaillent fort actuellement pour mettre en oeuvre différentes initiatives de développement économique, mais les vols militaires risquent de nuire considérablement au succès de ces efforts.

Le développement économique que visent les Montagnais est intimement lié aux territoires traditionnels et aux ressources qu'ils contiennent.

De génération en génération, les familles montagnaises ont développé une expertise et une compétence indéniables en matière de ressources renouvelables et de conservation des habitats.

Lorsqu'on dépend du territoire, et en particulier de la faune pour survivre, il n'est pas étonnant qu'on en prenne soin et qu'on tienne autant à en respecter l'intégrité.

Lors de la noyade des caribous dans la rivière Caniapiscau en septembre quatre-vingt-quatre ('84), par exemple, les Montagnais se sont insurgés contre l'irresponsabilité gouvernementale et en particulier celle de l'Hydro-Québec.

Le caribou constitue une ressource économique importante pour les Montagnais, en particulier ici à Schefferville où la communauté entend y développer la chasse communautaire sur des bases économiques viables.

Mais quel sera l'impact des vols militaires sur les troupeaux de caribous et sur ce projet de chasse communautaire? Les Montagnais auront-ils de nouveau à subir les conséquences des activités des non-indiens, à s'arranger avec les problèmes imprévus et à se contenter des restes? Ou des trous, comme dans les mines ici.

Pourtant, les gouvernements ont toujours prêché en faveur de l'amélioration des conditions de vie des indiens, en particulier de leur situation socio-économique.

Depuis quelques années, tout le monde prétend que seul le développement économique peut résoudre les problèmes des communautés montagnaises.

Tout le ministère des Affaires indiennes est actuellement dans une phase de restructuration où l'accent est précisément mis sur le développement économique des communautés.

Devant le Comité permanent des Affaires autochtones et du Développement du Nord, le vingt et un (21) mai mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six (1986), l'ex-ministre des Affaires indiennes, monsieur David Crombie, déclarait ce qui suit:

> "Comme vous le savez, le développement des Affaires indiennes et du Nord est guidé par deux (2) principes de base: premièrement, déplacer le centre décisionnel vers l'échelon local, qu'il s'agisse des collectivités indiennes ou des collectivités du Nord. Deuxièmement, travailler à créer un climat économique favorable, ainsi qu'à favoriser la stabilité et l'autosuffisance des indiens et des populations du Nord."

Au Québec, le ministre délégué aux Affaires autochtones, monsieur Raymond Savoie, déclarait dans une entrevue accordée au magazine Rencontre de juin quatre-vingt-six ('86) que ses priorités pour les revendications territoriales, que ses priorités, dis-je, sont les revendications territoriales, les affaires constitutionnelles et le développement économique.

En parlant des indiens qu'il a côtoyés, le ministre a affirmé, et je cite, que:

> "Plus l'activité économique et le degré d'instruction étaient grands, plus les chances étaient bonnes pour que la culture se porte bien et que les autochtones assument leur autonomie."

Enfin, il déclarait ce qui suit:

> "Ce que je cherche, c'est d'avoir une action immédiate. Quand je parle d'immédiat, je parle d'économie, de la condition sociale des autochtones. Il est clair qu'à l'exception peut-être des Cris et des Inuit, les autochtones vivent dans une situation de ghettos."

Du côté du ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche, le ministre en titre, monsieur Yvon Picotte, déclarait dans un discours daté du quatorze (14) février quatre-vingt-six ('86) que son ministère entend, et je cite:

> "Prendre tous les moyens disponibles pour assurer des prélèvements

suffisants",

pour les autochtones du Québec.

Enfin, lors du congrès plénier du Parti libéral du Québec en mars quatre-vingt-cinq ('85). la résolution numéro cent dix-huit (118) prévoit, et je dite:

> "Que le Parti libéral du Québec crée une véritable politique de mise en valeur et d'exploitation des ressources fauniques dans les régions nordiques dans lesquelles une place importante serait prise par les autochtones."

Les déclarations et les prises de position de ce genre abondent. Elles prêchent toutes en faveur du développement économique des communautés indiennes et d'un meilleur accès aux ressources fauniques. Mais est-ce que tout cela n'est encore que de fausses promesses vite oubliées lorsqu'il est question de s'approprier les territoires montagnais pour les manoeuvres militaires?

Si les gouvernements déclarent se préoccuper de plus en plus des droits et des conditions de vie des Montagnais, qu'attendent-ils pour réagir en leur faveur, étant donné la menace que représentent ces manoeuvres militaires?

Pourquoi le gouvernement fédéral, dont les indiens sont constitutionnellement sous sa responsabilité, hésite-t-il à prendre position pour les Montagnais?

Qu'attend le ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche pour se préoccuper des caribous et de la faune menacés par les vols militaires?

Pourquoi le Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement refuse-t-il de s'impliquer dans le dossier, alors que l'impact des vols militaires s'étend sur de vastes territoires sous sa juridiction?

Toutes ces questions demeurent actuellement sans réponse. Mais les membres de la Commission d'évaluation environnementale peuvent être assurés que le CAM entend poursuivre ses actions en vue de mettre fin aux vols à basse altitude et de bloquer le projet de base de l'OTAN à Goose Bay.

Enfin, j'aimerais faire part à la Commission de l'appui du CAM pour la tenue de réunions publiques dans certaines grandes villes telles que Québec et Montréal.

Les communautés sont maintenant informées du dossier et la Commission a pris bonne note, je l'espère, de leur position.

Il reste maintenant à informer les populations des grandes villes et à entendre ce qu'elles pensent des activités de la Défense nationale.

Ainsi, la Commission sera mieux à même de juger à quel point la position du CAM et des communautés montagnaises reflète une attitude partagée par la majorité de la population canadienne.

Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

I believe that this would be a good time to adjourn the meeting for the dinner hour. I understand that there are a few more speakers to be heard from from the Montagnais community and that that might take a further 40 or 45 minutes perhaps. So, what I would propose we do now is break for dinner and come back at seven o'clock. At that time we would continue this session and hear the rest of the Montagnais speakers.

Following which, we would begin our evening session when there will be some other speakers here, who are not here at the present time, when I will give another brief introduction of the Panel and the project. So, we will now break until seven o'clock.

I would ask each person to turn in the headsets on the way out the door, please. Pass it in as you leave. Thank you very much.

---Adjournment at 5:20 p.m.

---Upon commencing evening session at 7:00 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Thank you to those who have come back, who were here this afternoon, and thank you to those who were not here this afternoon for joining our meeting this evening.

My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of certain existing and proposed military flying activities over certain parts of Labrador and Quebec.

Before actually resuming the meeting, I would like, on behalf of all of the Panel Members and of all of our assistants, to thank the Chief of the Band Council and the other members of the Band Council and all other people who were involved in preparing the food for providing us with that delicious meal. We enjoyed it thoroughly and it was just the right thing to help us recover from the long afternoon and to prepare ourselves for this evening.

For those who have just joined the meeting, I would like to explain that we did not have enough time this afternoon to finish the session in which we were hearing presentations from the Montagnais people. So, what we are prepared to do is to finish that session, to hear the remainder of the Montagnais speakers, which should take perhaps 45 minutes to one hour.

After which, I will sort of start over again, for the benefit of those who are here for the first time tonight, by briefly explaining the process that we are carrying on.

For now, then, I would once again turn over the meeting to Mr. Mollen, seated at the table over on the side, who will introduce, in turn, the rest of the Montagnais speakers.

Mr. Mollen?

MR. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: (Speaks Montagnais. Introduces Bruno Pierre Harvey.)

---SOUMISSION PAR BRUNO PIERRE HARVEY: Je travaille pour le Conseil Attikamek. En fait, je viens présenter une situation qui aurait pu... qui continue un peu dans l'esprit de pensée de certains intervenants montagnais qui ont parlé cet après-midi.

En fait, mon but, ici, c'est de présenter surtout l'opinion, que je partage avec plusieurs écologistes, biologistes ici au Québec, sur les préoccupations que pourraient causer les impacts sur le troupeau de caribous de la rivière George.

Ça fait que j'ai apporté quelques acétates; je vais essayer de faire ça assez rapidement parce que pour connaître un peu le troupeau de la rivière Caribou et les impacts des vols, j'aimerais ça faire un petit historique des connaissances qu'on a sur le troupeau de la rivière George.

Ce qui caractérise beaucoup le troupeau de la rivière George, comme on l'a vu avec les intervenants cet après-midi, c'est que c'est un troupeau qui est migrateur en quelque sorte. C'est-à-dire qu'il doit fréquenter, lors de ses migrations, lors de ses mises bas plusieurs sites, plusieurs habitats, plusieurs habitats nordiques.

En mil neuf cent cinquante-quatre (1954), le MLCP a commencé à faire des inventaires sur le troupeau de la rivière George pour connaître

Soumission, Harvey

son état de population, son état démographique, puis ici, on a à peu près... on a à peu près les principaux inventaires qu'il y a eu au cours des années, à partir de mil neuf cent cinquante-quatre (1954) jusqu'à quatre-vingt-quatre ('84).

On voit un petit peu la croissance qu'il a eu. En mil neuf cent cinquante et un (1951) il y avait des biologistes qui criaient comme quoi le caribou de la rivière George était même en voie d'extinction. Puis depuis ce temps-là, bien on voit que le troupeau de caribous a connu une explosion démographique assez considérable.

Avec un graphique, on peut peut-être plus le visionner, au niveau de la croissance, comme ça.

On a les premiers inventaires en mil neuf cent cinquante-quatre (1954), où on mettait les caribous à... je ne dis pas à... à quelques milliers de bêtes, jusqu'à l'inventaire de mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), le dernier en liste, qui donnait environ six cent mille (600 000) têtes de caribou sur la rivière George.

Alors, naturellement, de la même manière, vu qu'un troupeau grossit, ça lui prend plus d'espace. Voici l'aire de distribution qu'on connaissait du troupeau de la rivière George, avec les

Soumission, Harvey

aires de mise bas qu'on peut identifier ici et un peu ici.

Bon, il s'agit du Lac Champ Doré ici; on est dans les terres du Labrador. Ça, c'était pour les années soixante et onze ('71), soixante et quinze ('75), à l'aide du "monitoring" que le MLCP fait avec des colliers émetteurs.

Un petit peu plus tard, en mil neuf cent soixante et seize (1976), quatre-vingt ('80), le territoire du caribou face à l'expansion démographique, bon il prend de plus en plus de territoire et on remarque aussi que les aires de mise bas sont en train de changer; elles se déplacent un peu vers le sud-ouest.

Les dernières données qu'on a du troupeau, en quelque sorte, ce sont celles-ci. C'est l'aire de distribution qu'on connaissait en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), avec la seule aire de mise bas maintenant qui va de la rivière George près du lac de la Hutte du Sauvage.

En fait, je vous présente ça tout simplement, la distribution, pour vous montrer, en quelque sorte, où vont se situer les vols militaires face au troupeau de caribous de la rivière George.

À l'aide des cartes fournies par le ministère de la Défense nationale, on n'a seulement

Soumission, Harvey

qu'à superposer les deux (2) cartes ici puis on peut apercevoir, qu'est-ce qui est en bleu, c'est l'aire d'entraînement militaire qui va se passer au Nouveau Québec et au Labrador.

Disons qu'on l'a aussi sur une carte ici que je pourrais peut-être vous montrer tout à l'heure là, mais pour le moment, disons qu'on peut situer que l'aire des vols militaires va toucher, entre autres, l'aire de distribution du troupeau de la rivière George au niveau de la rivière George, puis en partie, probablement, ils risquent de survoler les aires de mise bas du troupeau.

Alors, c'est quand même un phénomène assez important à considérer. En fait, plusieurs intervenants cet après-midi disaient:

> "Ils vont survoler nos territoires ancestraux",

mais ils vont survoler aussi les territoires ancestraux des caribous.

Avant de changer d'acétate, je voudrais vous présenter quelque chose. Je vous l'ai signalé tout à l'heure là, si j'étais capable de superposer les acétates... Tout à l'heure, j'attirais votre attention sur les aires de mise bas. Alors, on voit que le caribou, en plus d'être un animal migrateur, depuis à peu près cinq (5) à six (6) ans, a des

Soumission, Harvey

comportements plutôt particuliers, du moins pas ceux qu'on lui connaissait auparavant.

Avant, on savait qu'il partait, il faisait ses migrations à telle date puis on pouvait pratiquement prévoir quand est-ce qu'il passait.

Alors, depuis au moins mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980), les aires de mise bas ont changé, l'aire de distribution s'est considérablement élargie, suite justement à l'expansion démographique que le troupeau connaît.

Alors, je présente les deux (2) acétates, entre autres là, c'est tout simplement pour vous faire dire que le caribou, dans le moment, on ne le connaît pas. Alors, même si on voulait dire: "On va essayer de ne pas survoler là où l'aire de mise bas est active dans le moment", on ne sait pas, peut-être que l'aire de mise bas du lac Champ Doré, qui existait avant les années quatre-vingt ('80), il n'y a rien qui dit qu'elle ne deviendra pas effective dans un avenir proche.

Il y a plusieurs problèmes qu'on peut soulever face au survol de l'aire de distribution. Par exemple, cet après-midi, il y a eu plusieurs intervenants qui ont parlé entre autres de la pollution.

Les milieux nordiques, comme tout le

Soumission, Harvey

monde le sait, ce sont des milieux qui sont très lents dans la regénération face à des impacts tels que les feux et dans la récupération aussi.

C'est-à-dire que ce sont des milieux qui sont très très sensibles aux impacts environnementaux. Un bon exemple que j'ai ramassé tout à l'heure... pas tout à l'heure, mais hier, on parlait entre autres de la contamination. Pourtant, il n'y a jamais eu d'essai nucléaire dans le nord, mais le foie de caribou, les reins et en fait de plusieurs autres gibiers, sont contaminés. On est obligé d'avertir maintenant la population parce qu'on ne peut plus manger de ça, c'est dangereux.

La même chose qui s'est passée - tout le monde se rappelle l'accident qu'il y a eu en U.R.S.S., à Tchernobyl ce qui peut être un petit peu le pendant de la situation en Europe, en Laponie, c'est que maintenant les lapons sont obligés d'arrêter la chasse et l'élevage traditionnel du renne parce que maintenant le renne en Laponie est trop contaminé par les émissions radio-actives.

Bien, on peut s'imaginer aussi que ces choses-là pourraient arriver ici parce que, comme je disais auparavant, le milieu nordique, c'est un milieu qui est très très sensible et qui prend beaucoup de temps à se regénérer et à récupérer face à des impacts majeurs.

Ensuite, le problème avec les vols militaires, c'est qu'on n'a jamais étudié l'impact que peuvent avoir les vols militaires ou même de transport sur la faune.

Il y a beaucoup d'études. Les études se contredisent. Des fois, il y en a qui disent: "Bon, il n'y a pas d'impact", des fois, il y en a qui disent qu'il y a des impacts, mais comme tel, on n'a jamais eu vraiment d'étude sérieuse, surtout dans un cas aussi comme les vols militaires à très basse altitude, où ils auront à survoler en quelque sorte des régions susceptibles d'abriter des fortes concentrations. Et même si ce n'étaient pas des fortes concentrations, on n'est pas capable d'évaluer ou du moins il n'y a pas d'étude pour nous guider pour savoir la réaction face à... les femelles vont réagir différemment selon certains cycles, selon certaines périodes.

Monsieur du ministère de la Défense tout à l'heure nous parlait, entre autres, des études qui sont en train de se faire, par exemple au Labrador, sur les impacts socio-économiques et culturels et sur les impacts d'environnement face à la faune, tel que le caribou.

Il y a des études, effectivement, qui

Soumission, Harvey

se font dans le moment au Labrador. Entre autres, il y a celle de monsieur Fred Harrington, qui est parrainée par l'université je ne sais pas trop quoi.

Le problème, c'est que ce sont toujours des méthodologies qui sont appliquées de l'extérieur, parce que, entre autres, ce qu'on étudie dans le moment au Labrador, on étudie un petit troupeau, le troupeau du Mont Redwine au Labrador. C'est un troupeau de... je ne sais pas quelle quantité de caribous il y a, mais quelques milliers à peine. Puis c'est un troupeau qui est sédentaire. Donc, qui a toujours affaire au même milieu, qui ne bouge pas, qui ne change pas de... qui est beaucoup plus prévisible, en quelque sorte. C'est un troupeau dont on sait qu'il est là et qui ne bouge pas.

Alors que lorsqu'on fait affaire avec le troupeau du fleuve George, c'est une histoire...

D'ailleurs, c'est une question que je pourrais vous poser, monsieur, c'est que vous disiez, entre autres, au niveau de... avant de survoler les aires, on va faire appel à un programme pour savoir, bon, où sont les camps de chasse actifs et où sont les troupeaux de caribous puis il va y avoir des rapports qui vont nous être soumis.

Moi, j'aimerais bien savoir quel genre de rapport qui va être soumis parce que déjà le

MLCP travaille depuis au moins une quinzaine d'années sur le "monitoring" du caribou puis on parlait tout à l'heure de l'inventaire en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), la publication vient de sortir là, ça fait à peine un (1) mois.

Ça fait que ça faisait deux (2) ans qu'on attendait des réponses sur les déplacements récents et sur la population de caribous.

Ça fait que si vous attendez toujours ces rapports-là, ça veut dire qu'on va savoir où était le caribou voilà deux (2) ans quand on va survoler aujourd'hui. C'est un peu un danger en quelque sorte.

Il y a d'autres problèmes, c'est que le caribou, bon face à des situations, face à des périodes telles que la période de mise bas, si on dérange le caribou, on peut le faire changer d'endroit.

On a vu, entre autres, tout à l'heure que l'expansion du territoire, de l'aire de répartition, s'est considérablement agrandie. Mais là, ce sont des études préliminaires et très très récentes, c'est qu'on a fait un inventaire en quatre-vingt-six ('86) - les données ne sont pas encore disponibles. La courbe qu'on voyait tout à l'heure là, qui faisait une expansion comme ça, bien il semblerait que c'est en train de stagner. Le caribou ne croît plus, il n'a plus un taux de croissance comme on lui connaissait au début des années quatre-vingt ('80).

De la même manière, le MLCP, d'après des analyses préliminaires qui ont été faites cet été, a évalué que la condition physique du caribou n'était plus aussi bonne que lors des études qui ont été faites en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984).

C'est-à-dire que là, on est arrivé dans un point un peu charnière au niveau du caribou. Il a pris de l'expansion, il est venu à une démographie assez importante, mais là c'est un point charnière puis la condition est en train de diminuer, semblerait-il, la condition physique puis le taux de reproduction.

C'est-à-dire que ce que les spécialistes se posaient comme question depuis au moins quatre (4) cinq (5) ans; c'est-à-dire qu'à un moment donné, cette expansion-là, ça va finir quelque part. C'est-à-dire que les ressources alimentaires du nord vont être limitées. La population ne pouvait pas croître comme ça indéfiniment. Puis là, il semblerait que le territoire, en quelque sorte le milieu donne sa réponse, il dit: "Bon, là, vous êtes assez. La bouffe, il y en a pour tout le

Soumission, Harvey

monde, mais on ne peut plus vraiment aller beaucoup plus loin".

Alors, si on imagine toujours le survol des aires, le caribou, c'est sûr que si on commence à le survoler régulièrement dans des périodes très très sensibles comme le rut, c'est-à-dire au mois d'octobre, ou comme la période de mise bas à un moment donné, lui ce qu'il va faire, c'est qu'il va fuir.

D'ailleurs, un bon exemple, maintenant on chasse le caribou ici à Schefferville. On va dans la mine puis l'hiver, pendant plusieurs mois, il y avait du caribou. Les vieux peuvent en parler, il n'y en avait pas avant. Pourquoi? Parce qu'on faisait sauter la mine, il y avait les engins, il y avait du bruit, il y avait du harcèlement. Le caribou, lui, il ne veut rien savoir, il veut être tranquille, il veut avoir la paix. Il était dans le nord. Depuis que la mine est fermée, le caribou revient dans le territoire.

Alors, si on lui coupe le territoire ici, entre autres qu'on affecte l'aire de mise bas, qui est là, qui est la principale dans le moment, qui est lunée, bien on tue le coeur qui regénère le troupeau.

Alors, le troupeau va se déplacer

Soumission, Harvey

mais, conséquemment, il va perdre un territoire probablement très riche, comme monsieur Mathieu André nous disait, très riche en ressources alimentaires.

Au niveau de la faune aussi quand on parle des vols militaires, on parle du harassement. En plus de faire fuir l'animal, c'est qu'il y a des conséquences directes. Par exemple, l'étude de monsieur Harrington au Labrador, qu'est-ce qu'il étudie principalement, c'est le déplacement. On fait passer un avion puis on regarde: "Les caribous bougent, bon ils ont eu peur. Ils ne bougent pas, ils n'ont pas eu peur". Mais en fait, c'est plus compliqué que ça. Puis entre autres, Monsieur Mathieu nous le disait puis les autres intervenants cet après-midi, c'est qu'il y a un stress aussi qu'on ne peut pas nécessairement évaluer face aux déplacements. Le caribou peut rester là puis doubler son métabolisme de base. C'est-à-dire dépenser énormément énormément d'énergie tout en restant en place.

Puis ça, ce sont des choses qui sont dans le moment très très difficiles à évaluer parce qu'on n'a pas les méthodes pour le faire, puis je pense que si on avait à survoler puis à harasser un troupeau, qui est le plus gros troupeau sauvage en Amérique du Nord, je pense qu'on devrait faire attention puis essayer de faire des études en conséquences pour minimiser ou du moins connaître les impacts avant de continuer ou avant de survoler ces aires-là.

Sur les vols entre autres, c'est que c'est un effet additif en quelque sorte parce que quand tu passes une fois, l'animal est stressé. Si tu passes deux (2) fois, bien il va être encore plus stressé parce qu'il a dépensé de l'énergie pour se stresserpuis il est encore plus faible. Donc, les vols militaires fréquents auraient un effet additif sur le troupeau et sur les individus, les caribous en quelque sorte.

C'est-à-dire que plus on va passer souvent, plus on va leur faire peur, plus on risque de les traumatiser puis que, en conséquence, leur condition physique, leur apport alimentaire, ils vont pouvoir moins manger parce qu'ils vont avoir plus à se déplacer. Alors, c'est sûr qu'on pourra observer un taux de mortalité beaucoup plus grand dans les années à venir.

D'ailleurs, pour donner entre autres un problème de la sensibilité du caribou, avec le "monitoring" que le MLCP fait dans le moment, on se rend compte que maintenant, même pour le marquer, le caribou subit un stress. Maintenant, on appelle ça le stress du collier.

C'est-à-dire que maintenant, les biologistes essaient de les marquer pour pouvoir les suivre où ils s'en vont. avec des émetteurs, puis on se rend compte que seulement en les capturant puis avec le port de ces émetteurs-là, bien, il y a un taux de mortalité beaucoup plus fort chez les animaux qui sont marqués.

Donc, ils n'ont pas l'air à tellement tolérer la présence permanente d'objets et de harcèlement en quelque sorte.

Pour le caribou, c'est un peu drôle toujours de parler devant des gens entre autres qui connaissent peut-être même beaucoup mieux le caribou que moi, mais, bon, moi, j'arrive avec mes graphiques puis c'est peut-être plus compréhensible pour les commissaires.

Les indiens vont très bien comprendre ça, c'est que par exemple dans des périodes comme l'hiver quand tu déplaces un caribou, c'est-à-dire tu lui fais peur et tu lui fais courir un (1) mille, deux (2) milles, trois (3) milles, là tu le changes complètement de milieu, tu lui fais dépenser beaucoup d'énergie puis en hiver, en quelque sorte le caribou, bon il se tient dans les ravages puis il se tient dans les zones où les ressources alimentaires sont assez fortes.

Ce qui fait que si on le déplace éventuellement, on peut l'amener dans des régions, par des craintes, en le faisant fuir dans des régions où les ressources alimentaires ne seront pas adéquates. Puis en hiver, bon un animal qui ne se nourrit pas, disons qu'il devient beaucoup plus sensible à la prédation puis aux mortalités par le froid. Entre autres, pour les femelles qui sont accompagnées aussi par leurs jeunes.

En fait c'est ça, je pourrais peut-être terminer par des commentaires assez globaux. C'est qu'on se rend compte, vous voyez, je vous ai montré un petit peu tous les graphiques que les spécialistes - parce que ce n'est pas moi qui les ai faits - que les spécialistes s'attardent à faire depuis au moins une vingtaine d'années au MLCP puis un peu partout pour essayer de comprendre la biologie, l'écologie du caribou.

En fait, on s'aperçoit que c'est un troupeau qui est très difficile à cerner parce que, entre autres, il est gigantesque, parce qu'il fait beaucoup de migration, parce que c'est dans le nord aussi puis on a de la misère à aller chercher les données, ce n'est pas toujours accessible.

Je regardais un peu dans l'étude d'évaluation initiale du ministère de la Défense comment eux ils avaient interprété leur intervention, comment ils avaient traité un peu le domaine du caribou dans leur dossier.

Alors, je reproduis une carte que j'ai prise dans leur étude. Alors ça, ça provient de l'étude initiale environnementale du ministère de la Défense. Ça fait qu'on a tracé quelques lignes, on a tracé quelques points, on a identifié des régions. Mais comme tel, quand on parle du caribou, on parle des aires de mise bas ici. En fait, on aurait pu la mettre un petit peu plus en haut, un peu plus en bas. C'est qu'on ne sait pas trop qu'est-ce qui se passe avec le caribou puis il vaut mieux peut-être ne pas trop en parler non plus.

Ce que je veux soumettre ici comme idée, c'est que... En fait, je pourrais peut-être vous lire la déclaration de certains spécialistes et les ministres aussi l'ont clairement dit, au niveau des ressources du nord.

C'est Messier, Huot, ce sont des biologistes qui travaillent un peu partout ici, qui ont travaillé énormément sur le caribou. Ce sont des spécialistes au Québec du Caribou. Ils ont travaillé entre autres sur le dossier de commercialisation de la viande de caribou. Alors, ils sont assez impliqués dans tous les dossiers.

Soumission, Harvey

À un moment donné, ils ont fait une étude. L'étude la plus récente qui est sortie l'année passée sur le troupeau du fleuve George. Puis, en fait, ils arrivaient avec une conclusion ou c'était dans leur introduction; quoi qu'il en soit c'était l'image qu'ils voulaient dégager un peu de leur rapport. C'est que, je cite:

> "Le caribou occupe sans contredit une place de première importance parmi les ressources renouvelables du Nouveau Québec, et ce sur le plan économique et sur le plan de subsistance pour les populations autochtones. Tout impact négatif concernant le troupeau de caribous du fleuve George se traduira nécessairement par des effets non moins négatifs sur les populations humaines du nord québécois."

Alors là, on parle des gens qui vivent ici. Les gens qui vivent ici, les intervenants en parlaient cet après-midi, c'est qu'il y a toujours eu des gens qui venaient du sud, comme Iron Ore, comme... je ne sais pas trop, j'aime mieux ne pas trop les nommer. On s'installe ici, on fait du développement économique puis à un moment donné,

Soumission, Harvey

quand on ne fait plus d'argent, on reprend nos cliques puis nos claques puis on s'en va.

Les indiens puis beaucoup d'autres communautés aussi, les Inuit et les Neskapi vivent ici. On a vu l'importance du caribou pour ces communautés au niveau développement puis au niveau de ressources de subsistance. Ce qui existe depuis des millénaires.

Le caribou, il est sur le territoire, il traverse le territoire puis il fréquente assidument le territoire montagnais ici. C'est une ressource de première importance.

Parallèlement, on voit que les études, ça prend du temps. Justement, ça nous a pris deux (2) ans avant d'avoir les études sur le "monitoring" qui s'est fait en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), sur l'étude de la population qui s'est faite en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984).

Alors, les informations prennent du temps à circuler puis c'est assez compliqué de compiler les données. Dans le moment, on a des données, des observations comme quoi le caribou est en train d'entrer dans une période très sensible parce que la condition physique est en train de diminuer par rapport à l'exploitation, par rapport à la grosseur du troupeau.

Soumission, Harvey

Si, je dis bien si, parce qu'en fait comme je vous disais tout à l'heure, il n'y a pas d'étude dans le moment pour me faire dire si vraiment il va y avoir un impact négatif, mais avant de poursuivre, même avant de commencer le survol du Labrador par des avions militaires, je pense que la première ressource qu'il faudrait considérer dans le moment, naturellement ce sont les populations humaines, mais ce sont les populations animales parce qu'elles sont à la base de l'économie du nord puis elles sont à la base de la vie traditionnelle ici pour les Montagnais.

Puis comme on voit, moi personnellement, si on me présentait un graphique comme ça pour me parler du troupeau de caribous, je pense que je ne prendrais pas tellement ça au sérieux.

Ce qui fait que de la même manière qu'il y avait des questions tout à l'heure qui étaient posées avant le souper pour savoir comment le ministère de la Défense entend avoir les données concernant le "monitoring", c'est-à-dire concernant les déplacements et les périodes où est le caribou, je pense qu'il va falloir faire une étude pour savoir comment on va la faire puis il va y avoir beaucoup d'intervenants là-dedans, dont les indiens, parce qu'en fait ce sont eux peut-être qui connaissent plus le caribou.

Mon intervention en quelque sorte se situe à deux (2) niveaux. C'est-à-dire qu'elle se situe, bon pour les Montagnais dans le sens que je sais, je connais l'importance du caribou pour eux, j'ai travaillé sur un projet de développement aussi de chasse et de subsistance avec eux autres. Mais aussi, c'est en tant qu'écologiste et en tant que biologiste travaillant en environnement.

Dans les commissions environnementales comme ça, surtout sur les impacts environnementaux en écologie, on critique souvent les écologistes, les biologistes de vouloir arrêter tout développement. C'est-à-dire que les biologistes sont toujours contre le développement.

En fait, moi j'ai tourné un peu la question là-dessus parce que je me dis: "Les biologistes ne sont pas contre le développement", ce n'est pas une question d'être pour ou contre le développement, il s'agit de savoir pour qui on fait ce développement-là.

Puis dans le moment, il semblerait que ce n'est pas pour les Montagnais de Schefferville.

Merci.

M. ZACHARIE MOLLEN: Mr. Bernard Cléry, the negotiator for the Montagnais Council will make his representation to the Commission.

---SOUMISSION PAR BERNARD CLÉRY: Messieurs les membres de l'exécutif du Conseil Attikamek Montagnais, messieurs les chefs, chef de Schefferville et conseillers, gens de Schefferville.

Aujourd'hui, la population de Schefferville reçoit de la grande visite.

De la visite qui tente de savoir ce que les Montagnais de Schefferville pensent du projet de l'armée canadienne qui consiste à développer une base militaire à Goose Bay, peut-être un aéroport-satellite à Schefferville et un vaste champ de pratique pour les militaires canadiens et ceux des pays alliés.

On veut occuper les militaires en temps de paix pour que les populations qui paient n'aient pas l'impression que ces personnes sont totalement inutiles.

En fait, quand je dis qu'on veut savoir ce qu'on en pense, je devrais plutôt dire qu'on veut se donner bonne conscience pour pouvoir dire, probablement aux dirigeants de l'OTAN, que les populations indigènes ont été rencontrées sur cette question.

Pour vous démontrer cette avancée, permettez-moi, simplement, de citer une déclaration du ministre canadien de la Défense, monsieur Perrin

Beatty, lue dans le Journal de Québec, le douze (12) septembre dernier et je cite:

> "Il est évident que les opposants au projet ne le feront pas avorter si les seize (16) pays membres de l'OTAN choisissent Goose Bay à leur réunion du début de décembre à Bruxelles, mais ils auront au moins eu l'occasion de faire connaître leurs préoccupations et il n'est pas dit qu'on n'en tiendra pas compte."

Par une telle déclaration, le ministre de la Défense exprime clairement l'intérêt qu'il porte aux travaux de la Commission et surtout ce qui pourrait en ressortir.

Étant en voyage en Allemagne de l'Ouest, un pays favorable aux vols à basse altitude au Canada - il faut souligner que chez eux, la population ne veut pas de ces vols à basse altitude, donc ils doivent aller ailleurs - monsieur Beatty se devait de rassurer ses alliés sur les effets négatifs, pour la vente du projet, du "grenouillage" des indiens qui s'y opposent farouchement.

Il ne faut surtout pas oublier que la campagne de mise en marché pour la vente du projet par l'armée canadienne en Europe et ailleurs s'appuie sur le fait que les colporteurs en costume prétendent qu'il n'y a personne sur ce vaste territoire.

Or, les Montagnais affirment le contraire et ajoutent même qu'en tant qu'aboriginaux, ils ont des droits fonciers de premiers occupants, ce qui est d'ailleurs implicitement reconnu par le gouvernement canadien puisqu'il négocie présentement avec les Montagnais une entente territoriale pour faire reconnaître ce territoire ancestral revendiqué.

L'armée canadienne est donc en pleine usurpation de pouvoirs puisqu'elle offre à vendre, ou à louer, un territoire qui ne lui appartient pas.

Dans le privé, ou le monde ordinaire, en se fondant sur les lois canadiennes, on emprisonnerait un agent d'immeubles qui oserait offrir à vendre un terrain dont il n'est pas propriétaire ou qu'il n'a pas reçu de mandat de vendre.

Pourquoi le gouvernement canadien tolère-t-il un tel abus de pouvoirs lorsqu'il s'agit d'une de ses créatures?

L'OTAN doit sérieusement prendre en considération qu'un jour ses alliés seront chassés manu militari par les Montagnais qui auront retrouvé leur territoire ancestral parce que jamais ils n'accepteront la militarisation du territoire retrouvé et surtout sa destruction.

L'OTAN, comme organisation internationale respectueuse des droits aboriginaux, doit donc prendre en considération la revendication territoriale des Montagnais avant de décider d'occuper ce territoire qui n'appartient pas à son allié, le Canada.

En langage d'affaires et même juridique, l'OTAN doit savoir que ce territoire n'a pas encore été libéré de tous les liens.

Il constitue donc un danger pour tous ceux qui voudraient l'utiliser à des fins autres que celles qui intéressent les véritables propriétaires, les Montagnais, et une telle action en ferait automatiquement des complices d'usurpation de droits et de pouvoirs.

Un tel respect de la consultation exprimé dans la citation du début par le ministre canadien de la Défense montre bien l'esprit des promoteurs de ce projet qui croient que parce qu'ils incarnent la force, tout doit plier sur leur passage. Pour eux, il est évident que l'aspect social, l'aspect écologique et même légal de ce dossier n'ont aucune importance.

On nous force donc à accepter un avenir incertain, même destructeur pour la population, en échange d'une paix millénaire des premiers habitants de cette région, en harmonie avec la nature.

On nous force donc, avec le plus grand sérieux du monde, à céder notre territoire aux militaires pour qu'ils puissent s'amuser à jouer à la guerre, comme le font les enfants blancs avec les jeux vidéos, mais à coup de milliards de dollars, ou à pratiquer à s'entretuer.

On nous offre de militariser un coin de terre, depuis toujours pacifique, pour en faire un endroit stratégique à abattre en premier lieu en cas de guerre mondiale. De champ de tir pratique en temps de paix, ce territoire deviendra une cible à abattre en temps de guerre.

Seulement sur cette partie de militarisation, nous devons nous battre pour le reste des québécois, qui ne semblent pas comprendre l'importance d'une telle décision, parce qu'eux aussi, un jour, subiront les effets négatifs de ce geste inconsidéré.

C'est donc un devoir pour nous, comme bons voisins, de prendre leur défense et de leur dire qu'ils sont en train de se faire passer un Québec par les généraux de l'armée canadienne, sans que leur gouvernement provincial ne lève le petit doigt.

Et quand j'entends dire, avec tout le

sérieux du monde par le ministre Raymond Savoie que le SAGMAI veut prendre la place du ministère des Affaires indiennes et du Nord canadien dans la défense des indiens du Québec, j'en pouffe de rire.

Où est-il donc caché notre Don Quichotte national pendant que nous nous battons dans ce dossier majeur, comme David devant le géant Goliath?

En échange de ce marché de dupes, le gouvernement canadien ne nous offre même pas de miroir. Il est encore moins généreux que les gouvernements des traités passés, signés par d'autres indiens du Canada. Cela doit certainement être dû aux coupures budgétaires...

Les dirigeants canadiens nous demandent, encore une fois, de nous tasser, toujours plus loin, pour faire de la place à leur projet de militarisation.

D'abord, ils devraient savoir qu'il n'y a plus de place au nord puisque les vols à basse altitude sont en train de tout détruire, que le gouvernement du Québec a acheté une très grande partie de ce territoire pour une bouchée de pain et qu'il l'a noyé et qu'au sud, les blancs nous y ont chassés, depuis belle lurette, par leur occupation pacifique.

Où est-ce qu'on pourrait aller pratiquer nos activités traditionnelles? Sur les plaines d'Abraham à Québec ou sur le Mont Royal à Montréal?

Qu'on nous dise une fois pour toutes qu'il n'y a plus de place pour les indiens au Canada. Qu'on cesse de nous raconter, pour la tribune internationale, des histoires abracadabrantes de respect des peuples autochtones du Canada. On ne leurre plus personne ici avec ce genre de fable. On agira alors en conséquence.

Ils nous demandent simplement de céder notre territoire à des habitués à la destruction, souvent inconséquents, qui vont sûrement nous conduire un jour à l'apocalypse causée par la guerre nucléaire.

On voudrait que l'on ne dise pas un mot et que l'on accepte un tel sort. Je comprends que notre passé ait pu faire croire aux généraux de l'armée canadienne que nous étions assez bonasses pour accepter beaucoup de choses, mais comment ont-ils pu croire que nous soyons assez ridicules et inconséquents pour accepter un génocide sans mot dire? Quand même...

La majorité, sinon la totalité, des gens bien-pensants ou informés sont convaincus des dangers pour les populations, autant humaines qu'animales, de ces vols à basse altitude et craignent des effets désastreux. Pourtant, on continue ce genre d'activités sans en connaître les effets réels.

Plus encore, à notre demande légitime de moratoire, parce que ce sont les Montagnais qui vivent présentement ces vols à basse altitude et qu'ils sont les cobayes des effets insoupçonnés, on n'a pas osé répondre.

On se contente simplement de s'enfouir la tête dans le sable et d'espérer que les gens oublieront de renouveler cette demande.

Non, on n'oubliera pas, parce que nous sommes convaincus de la justesse de cette demande de moratoire.

D'ailleurs, un des comités du gouvernement d'Ottawa qui, entre parenthèses, ne comprend aucun Montagnais, vous pouvez bien vous l'imaginer - le Comité permanent de l'environnement et des forêts a publié un rapport appuyant l'idée d'un moratoire sur les manoeuvres aériennes militaires en territoire montagnais. Plus spécifiquement, le Comité recommande, et je cite:

> "Le ministère de la Défense nationale devrait mettre fin immédiatement à tous les vols militaires en rase-mottes au-dessus de la Côte-Nord et

> du Labrador. Le ministre devrait faire évaluer les répercussions de tels vols sur l'environnement dans ces régions et ce, dans les plus brefs délais."

Source: Canada, Chambre des communes, Comité permanent de l'environnement et des forêts, le seize (16) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86), page dix-neuf (19).

Je pourrais aussi ajouter que nous avons eu de nombreux appuis au cours des dernières semaines de la part de canadiens, comme par exemple, la Conférence des évêques, la Commission des droits et libertés, la Confédération des syndicats nationaux, la Fédération des travailleurs du Québec, la Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec, une quarantaine de groupes qui défendent l'environnement et de nombreux citoyens sur cette question, sur cette demande d'arrêter les vols à basse altitude tant et aussi longtemps que des études environnementales sérieuses n'auront pas démontré, hors de tout doute, qu'il n'existe pas de danger pour les humains ou que l'environnement ne sera pas détruit par une telle opération militaire et que la négociation territoriale entre les Montagnais et les gouvernements, fédéral et provinciaux, de Québec et de Terre-Neuve, ne sera pas terminée.

Monsieur le président, messieurs les

Soumission, Cléry

commissaires, lors des dernières audiences à La-Romaine, le Conseil Attikamek vous a clairement demandé de l'appuyer dans sa demande de moratoire et d'exiger que pendant le travail de votre Commission et l'étude d'impacts, l'armée canadienne cesse ses vols à basse altitude.

Vous avez donc eu le temps de réfléchir à cette demande et de l'étudier sérieusement. Je voudrais donc aujourd'hui que vous nous répondiez clairement et que vous nous disiez si oui ou non vous êtes avec nous pour exiger un tel moratoire ou si vous voulez continuer à servir de paravent - j'allais dire de gilet pare-balles pour rester dans le ton - à l'armée canadienne dans le projet de militarisation.

Vous devez comprendre que, pour nous, il est important de savoir où se situe la crédibilité de votre Commission. Nous n'avons pas l'intention d'attacher notre canot après un bateau qui prend l'eau de toute part. Vous savez, on s'est fait si souvent tromper que le scepticisme a pris le dessus sur la confiance aveugle.

Puisque j'en suis aux questions, je voudrais aussi vous demander si vous avez exigé, et à quelle période, que l'armée canadienne organise une exhibition de vols à basse altitude pour que les membres de la Commission, les spécialistes, les populations concernées et la population canadienne en général puissent juger, au vu et su de tout le monde, des effets négatifs de ces vols pour en parler avec plus de connaissances et avoir un jugement plus éclairé sur cette importante question?

Étant donné la limpidité des intentions de l'armée canadienne dans ce dossier, comme nous le souligne si souvent et avec candeur son colporteur attitré ici présent, il ne devrait pas y avoir de problème à une telle demande, d'autant plus qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un secret d'état.

S'il fallait que l'armée s'oppose à une telle demande, des malins pourraient bien rapidement penser qu'elle a des choses à cacher à la population et qu'elle ne veut pas que la lumière soit entièrement faite sur les dangers de ces vols à basse altitude.

Quoi qu'il en soit, nous sommes convaincus que vous, les commissaires, souhaitez que l'on ne prenne aucun risque dans ce dossier et que vous allez faire le nécessaire pour que l'armée canadienne donne toutes les informations sur ce projet.

C'est d'ailleurs la raison de la présence du relationiste de l'armée canadienne à chaque journée d'audience. Vous nous avez dit, vous-mêmes, pour justifier sa présence aux audiences à La-Romaine, qu'il était là comme représentant de l'armée canadienne afin de répondre à toutes les questions. C'est pour nous une des questions les plus importantes et, malheureusement, nous ne pouvons pas nous contenter d'une réponse verbale.

Il faut que les avions témoignent si nous voulons connaître toute la vérité.

Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires, si jamais vous mettiez en doute les témoignages de certains Montagnais de La-Romaine ou d'ailleurs, ou encore si vous aviez à l'esprit qu'il y aurait peut-être de l'exagération lorsque des chasseurs, des femmes ou des enfants vous disent qu'ils étaient morts de peur après le passage d'un avion à basse altitude, je voudrais vous citer le témoignage d'un des membres du Comité permanent des Affaires autochtones, monsieur Keith Penner, au cours d'une réunion le douze (12) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86).

Monsieur Penner a raconté son expérience personnelle des vols à basse altitude. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous ajouter que monsieur Penner n'est pas un Montagnais et qu'il n'est pas député de la Basse Côte-Nord.

Le député de la Basse Côte-Nord, comme vous le savez sans aucun doute, est notre illustre premier ministre du Canada, monsieur Brian Mulroney qui, entre parenthèses, est terriblement silencieux sur ce dossier.

Voici donc ce que monsieur Penner a raconté, et je cite:

> "J'ai une anecdote pour vous, une blague, si vous le permettez, monsieur le président.
>
> Il y a un an environ, je faisais du pouce dans une des régions les plus isolées du monde, au nord du Pays de Galles, sur le Mont Snowdon, et un jet est venu dont on ne sait où, m'est passé au-dessus de la tête en rase-mottes. Je dois vous dire que le caucus libéral a failli perdre un de ses membres. J'étais terrorisé et j'ai failli perdre la vie sur les flancs du Mont Snowdon.
>
> Je n'ai eu aucun avertissement. J'en ris maintenant parce que cela remonte à un an. Mais à l'époque, je puis vous assurer que je ne riais pas. J'étais écrasé contre le sol",

Soumission, Cléry

je cite toujours,

> "tremblant de tous mes membres. Je sympathise donc avec les Innus qui ont eu cette expérience alors qu'ils étaient à la chasse, à la pêche ou en train de piéger. Ce n'est pas ce genre d'expérience qu'on aimerait avoir deux (2) fois dans son existence."

Un tel témoignage, totalement impartial, à lui seul, devrait en faire réfléchir plus d'un.

Plusieurs autres témoignages aussi percutants de membres de la Chambre des Communes ont invité le gouvernement fédéral à être prudent dans ce dossier de militarisation de ce coin de terre.

Puisque l'on a tendance à nous dire que les Terreneuviens sont aveuglément favorables, à cause du développement économique d'une base militaire à Goose Bay, à ce projet de l'armée canadienne, permettez-moi de vous citer des parties importantes de la déclaration du député provincial G. Long, de Terre-Neuve, lors des débats du Comité mixte spécial du Sénat et de la Chambre des Communes sur les Relations extérieures du Canada, le vingt-trois (23) janvier quatre-vingt-six ('86). Il a déclaré, entre autres, ceci, et je cite:

> "J'en profite pour manifester notre irritation suscitée par notre impuissance, l'absence de dialogue ou de consultation devant une présence militaire croissante."

Un autre passage:

> "La militarisation du Labrador va s'accentuer, bien au-delà des vols à basse altitude, si le contrat en question est accordé et réalisé."

Une autre citation:

> "Dans le fond, je pense qu'il s'agit d'une façon bien commode et bon marché que prennent les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux pour tenter d'atténuer temporairement des problèmes socio-économiques qui frappent une région nordique éloignée."

Enfin, une autre citation:

> "Comme je l'ai précisé, on ne s'est pas inquiété des aspects sociaux, écologiques, économiques ou autres effets possibles de ces aménagements."

Voilà donc le témoignage d'un empêcheur de tourner en rond dans ce dossier bien vendu, avec des moyens financiers énormes, par l'armée canadienne et le gouvernement fédéral dans la province de Terre-Neuve.

Permettez-moi d'ouvrir une parenthèse pour bien vous démontrer à quel point les gens favorables au dossier sont favorisés par le gouvernement fédéral sur tous les points et surtout sur celui important du financement des opérations de mise en marché de leur position respective.

J'oublierai ici toutes les centaines de milliers de dollars investis par l'armée canadienne pour vendre ce projet, ce qui est déjà honteux, pour uniquement souligner les inégalités directes et l'injustice flagrante causées par le gouvernement fédéral et ses porte-paroles.

Lors des récentes délibérations du Comité permanent des Affaires autochtones et du Développement du Nord en mai et en juin dernier, la question du financement de certains organismes concernés par les manoeuvres aériennes militaires a été soulevée.

Il fut alors confirmé par monsieur Neil Overend, sous-ministre adjoint intérimaire, dans le secteur Autonomie au ministère des Affaires indiennes et du Nord, que ce ministère ne finance pas les autochtones dans leurs activités d'opposition aux manoeuvres militaires.

Ce qui fut d'ailleurs confirmé par un conseiller de la communauté de La-Romaine, monsieur Guy Bellefleur, ici présent.

Et en même temps, les membres de ce même comité apprenaient que le ministre de la Justice d'abord, monsieur Crosbie, avait accordé, et je cite:

> "... des subsides de cent cinquante mille dollars (150 000,00$) à la ville de Happy Valley, Goose Bay, afin de leur permettre d'engager les services d'un attaché de projet et d'un assistant à la recherche pour les dix-huit (18) prochains mois, dans le but précis de vendre ce projet."

Ce comité a aussi permis de savoir que le journal local "Them Days" a également reçu dix mille dollars (10 000,00$) pour réaliser un numéro spécial vantant sûrement les mérites d'un tel projet pour les sociétés concernées.

Dans tout ce débat, à ce stade-ci, le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais a dû utiliser des ressources et de l'argent pris ailleurs pour préparer les dossiers présentés ici et devant d'autres publics.

Notons que les préoccupations des

Montagnais ont été jusqu'à maintenant présentées, sans résultat d'ailleurs, au gouvernement fédéral par la voie du Comité permanent des Affaires autochtones et du développement du Nord de la Chambre des Communes, le vingt-trois (23) mai et le douze (12) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86); le Comité mixte spécial du Sénat et la Chambre des Communes sur les relations extérieures du Canada, le vingt-trois (23) janvier quatre-vingt-six ('86); le Comité spécial du Sénat sur la Défense nationale, le vingt-quatre (24) octobre quatre-vingt-cinq ('85); le Comité permanent de la Défense nationale de la Chambre des Communes, le quinze (15) avril, le vingt-quatre (24) avril, le cinq (5) mai et le deux (2) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86); le Comité permanent de l'environnement et des forêts de la Chambre des Communes, le dix-huit (18) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86) et le vingt-trois (23) octobre quatre-vingt-cinq ('85).

Comme vous pouvez le constater, les efforts n'ont pas manqué et ce, sans aucun appui financier direct du gouvernement fédéral pour ce projet précis. Ce que l'on peut y retirer comme leçon, c'est que le partage, prôné par les blancs dans ce dossier est celui que nous vivons depuis de nombreuses années; un oeuf de petit oiseau contre un orignal. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire que l'oeuf, c'est pour nous.

Avant de conclure, je voudrais attirer votre attention sur les nombreuses contradictions des défenseurs des vols à basse altitude à tout prix sur les résultats des études écologiques, comme on a parlé tantôt.

Permettez-moi, pour faire cette démonstration, de citer les propos du ministre de la Défense d'alors, monsieur Harvie Andre, au cours des délibérations du Comité spécial du Sénat sur la Défense nationale, le vingt-quatre (24) octobre mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-cinq (1985) et du Comité permanent de la Défense nationale à la Chambre des Communes le deux (2) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86), et je cite:

> "Une évaluation écologique déjà effectuée indique que les conséquences environnementales seraient minimes."

Il ajoute:

> "Les inconvénients du bruit et autres peuvent être atténués appréciablement. Ils ne toucheraient qu'une poignée d'individus."

D'autre part, le lieutenant-général Manson répondait de la façon suivante à une question sur les mêmes études écologiques, et je cite:

> "Je sais qu'une étude des retombées environnementales des vols à basse altitude dans la région de Goose Bay a été effectuée il y a plusieurs années. Si mes souvenirs sont bons, les résultats de l'étude ont révélé que ces vols à basse altitude causaient des torts réels à l'environnement."

Qui croire?

Deux (2) informations diamétralement opposées sur le même sujet, par des personnes qui connaissaient sûrement les vraies réponses. Puisque l'un des deux (2) intervenants parle de torts réels, alors que l'autre y voit tout juste des conséquences minimes, il faut se rendre à l'évidence que l'un des deux (2) ment.

Pourquoi?

En terminant, je veux remercier les représentants de cette Commission de nous avoir permis de déposer à cette table ce que nous croyons être utile à l'éclaircissement de ce dossier déjà passablement ambigu. Nous y allons d'abondance parce que nous croyons sincèrement que cette Commission pourrait avoir un rôle déterminant dans la poursuite de ce dossier si les commissaires en décidaient ainsi.

Puisque le gouvernement fédéral, par la voix de son ministre de la Défense qui nous dit que ce projet va se réaliser, malgré les opposants, et par le silence éloquent du premier ministre Mulroney, député du comté concerné, qui n'ose même pas se prononcer, ne semble pas vouloir nous écouter, il nous reste cette Commission et l'opinion publique.

C'est pour cette raison que nous voulons que vous nous répondiez franchement sur les deux (2) questions posées: la demande de moratoire et la comparution des avions.

Ces questions sont cruciales pour nous dans la stratégie que nous devons rapidement élaborer. Nous ne pouvons plus, à ce stade-ci, nous permettre d'attendre bien longtemps puisque l'OTAN doit prendre une décision d'ici le mois de décembre prochain.

Pendant que nous palabrons devant une Commission probablement bidon (nous avons besoin d'être convaincus du contraire et les réponses à nos questions vont être une indication claire), le ministre de la Défense nationale, monsieur Beatty, et l'armée canadienne font du "lobbying" auprès des alliés de l'OTAN et avec certains résultats et surtout sans opposition pour vendre leur projet.

Enfin, je tiens à remercier la population de la communauté montagnaise de Schefferville qui a démontré, par les témoignages de son chef et ceux éloquents de ses sages, qu'elle ne voulait pas des vols à basse altitude et des supposées retombées, qu'elle voulait simplement vivre en paix, comme elle l'a fait au cours des temps passés, et chasser le caribou sans être dérangée par les oiseaux de malheur volant à basse altitude.

Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

I will respond now to questions that you have asked.

In response to the first question, the Panel has not at this time requested the Government of Canada to impose a moratorium on low level flying during the course of this review.

In the first place, you will realize that we are in the midst of a very hectic schedule of public meetings which began at La Romaine and there has not been, in fact, an opportunity since that time for the Panel to meet privately and to discuss that issue.

I would want to say further that to request a moratorium would be to request a change to the terms of reference of the Panel, which has been given to the Panel by the Minister of the Environment. To do so, would be a rare thing. It is customary for these panels, appointed under the Environmental Assessment process of the Government of Canada, to accept their mandates as given. We will keep your question in mind and we will consider it further.

In answer to your second question, the Panel, through its Secretariat, is, in fact, in the process of arranging with the Department of National Defence for a demonstration of low level flying for the benefit of the Panel, so that the Panel can experience something of that situation. Perhaps not in exactly the same way as would be experienced by Native people in the bush, but coming as close to that as we can arrange within practical limits.

We will invite along, on that occasion, representatives of the news media so that they can be present and that they can report to the public on what goes on at that time in any way that they may wish to do.

I think that is all I would care to say at the present time in answer to those two questions.

Now, I gather, then, that the presentations from the Montagnais community have been concluded. So, I will go on to, as I indicated earlier, restate briefly what I said at the beginning of this afternoon's session for the benefit of the people who were not here this afternoon and have just joined the meeting this evening.

First of all, as I said earlier, this Panel, which you see seated at the table before you, has been appointed by the Minister of Environment to examine this whole proposal of certain military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec.

It is important to understand something of the process that we are involved in here. The origins of the process go back to 1974 when the Government of Canada established an environmental assessment process which would examine projects, for which the Government of Canada is somehow responsible, before the Government makes a decision on whether those projects are to proceed or not.

In this particular case, the review of these military flying activities began about six months ago, in February of 1986, when the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment describing their proposal and asking him to appoint a panel to conduct a public environmental review of this project. That could be regarded as a first of six steps which, together, make up the review of the project from beginning to end.

The remainder of the review is expected to take approximately 18 months, so that the entire review may cover a period of approximately two years.

The second step in the process was the appointment of the Panel and the publication by the Panel of a document which we call Draft Guidelines. To explain a little further, the Panel was appointed by the Minister in July of this year and was given its terms of reference which called for the examination of a proposal which consists of two parts. The first part being the on-going low level flight training activity which commenced, as I understand it, approximately five or six years ago and which has involved the participation of several NATO member countries under arrangements, which are called bilateral agreements, with the Government of Canada.

Regarding that on-going activity, the Panel has been asked to examine the activity; to examine any evidence presented to it concerning possible environmental and other impacts; to recommend to the Government special measures should be taken to offset or minimize any undesirable effects of that activity; and, I suppose, to look at the positive side of things, to recommend any measures to enhance any beneficial effects which might be arising from those activities. That is the first part of the proposal.

The second part is a proposal to establish a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, to be built and operated out of Goose Bay, Labrador. In the case of that part of the project, the Panel has been asked to recommend, first of all, whether or not such a flight training centre for NATO should be established or should not be established. Secondly, to recommend once again on any measures which should be taken to either minimize unpleasant impacts of that part of the project and to enhance any beneficial impacts. So, you will see that the Panel's mandate, with regard to the two parts of the proposal, is different.

During the spring and summer, in order to assist the Panel, staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office held informal meetings in various locations with a number of parties interested in this proposal, in the review. Those consisted of agencies of the federal and provincial and municipal governments and representatives of various groups of

Native people.

From its examination of the discussions that went on in those meetings and from its own evaluation of the situation, the Panel put together a document which will eventually be called the Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement. That document will serve as the instructions from the Panel to the Department of National Defence which that department will use in preparing one of the key documents in this whole review. That is a report called the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are now in the midst of public meetings, the first series of public meetings that this Panel held. The main purpose of these meetings is to receive comments from the public on that draft document that we issued, the Draft Guidelines. At the same time, of course, we are hearing many other things from the people who come to speak to us and this is perfectly all right because, after all, this is the first time that the Panel has appeared in public and we anticipated that people would have various things to say to us and that they might not all be directly on the subject of that Draft Guidelines document.

These meetings will continue through the month of October, following which the Panel will meet privately, will examine all of the information that it has received from these meetings, and modify this draft document in accordance with what we have heard.

Then, in December of this year, the Panel will issue the final form of the Guidelines document to the Department of National Defence and that will complete the third step of the review.

Step number four will be the actual preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement by the Department of National Defence and at its expense, I might add. In that process, the Department will review existing information, will conduct any new studies which may be necessary, and will write its report. Finally, in step four, National Defence will present its Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel. We are expecting that to happen sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

Step number five in the process will be the examination of the Environmental Impact Statement by the Panel and various government agencies and also by the public, because the Environmental Impact Statement will be made public as soon as it is submitted to the Panel.

Once that Panel has determined that the Environmental Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is that it has met the instructions, the guidelines that the Panel issued previously, the Panel will announce public hearings to discuss the project. The public hearings actually form the final public part of this review process and these are likely to be held sometime in the fall of 1987.

Step number six, the last step in the

review, will involve the preparation, the writing of a report by the Panel itself in which it will report to the Government on all that it has heard. We will discuss the project, we will discuss the expected impacts of the project and we will make recommendations along the lines of -- as I described a few minutes ago. That report of the Panel will be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence most likely sometime late in 1987 or early 1988. That is why I say that, altogether, the whole process may take approximately two years.

We have with us today, as is customary, a representative of the Department of National Defence. I would introduce him to you at this time for those of you who are at the back and perhaps have not seen him yet. He is Major David McCabe. I would ask him to stand up. He stands out very well anyway because of what he is wearing, of course.

I say it is the custom of these Panels to have a representative of the promotor, the proponent of the project, present at all public meetings so that the Panel can be sure that it is receiving, and that the public is receiving, good and accurate information on exactly what the project is. It is important for everyone to understand the nature of the project that the Panel has been asked to examine.

Given that, it is starting to get a little late. I have already spoken to Major McCabe about this, I am asking him once again to present a shortened version of what he said this afternoon, so that we may hear from anyone in the audience who wishes to speak after that.

In addition to presenting a brief description of the project, Major McCabe is also prepared to answer questions from the audience on the subject of the nature of the project. So, Major McCabe, would you go to the table at the side and give us your presentation, please?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, and attendees who have just come in this evening. I do appreciate having an opportunity once again to address you. At the request of the Chairman and also in recognition of the fact that a number of people have already heard this presentation, I will attempt to keep this as short as possible and try to concentrate on the proposals that have been mentioned by the Chairman.

I think for, probably, most people who have lived around here for a long time and know a lot about the area, ever since Goose Bay was built in 1941, there has been a military presence. It has fluctuated from time to time and in recent years, particularly since the beginning of the eighties, there has been a moderate increase in military activity, primarily in the area of low level flying training.

Just to give a brief description of the current operations in Goose Bay, there are three, actually four militaries present. Three of them are allied militaries, as we call them, allied users. The United States Air Force, which has basically always had a presence in Goose Bay, primarily services transient transport aircraft, aircraft that are going across the ocean to Europe to resupply American bases. It is a very small detachment that exists in Goose Bay.

The Royal Air Force of the United Kingdom has had a presence in Goose Bay for many years. In the early years they used to fly Vulcan bombers, a small number of them; in the recent years they have been flying fighter aircraft or fighter bombers; and at present they have nine Tornado aircraft in place in Goose Bay for the flying season, which usually runs from March to the end of October.

The German Air Force has been flying in Goose Bay since 1981. It started off fairly small and now has just short of what is their maximum limit of 25 aircraft. Throughout the flying season they vary the numbers and they vary the types of aircraft that come in to Goose Bay.

Last but certainly not least, from my point of view, is the Canadian Forces presence. We do not do any flying, if you like, to speak of there, no flying training. The Canadian Forces that are there have several roles. One is to support the long range radar, which has been there for quite a few years; another is to man and support, if you like, the air traffic control radar system on the airfield; a third, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces established a base rescue flight of three helicopters. They are based in Goose Bay on a permanent basis all year. I think of interest and, really, a connection with the current allied activity, is a Military Co-ordination Centre that is manned by the Canadian Forces. This was established two years ago in an effort to more closely control allied military flying in the local area. All local flights of a military nature have to file flight plans of their route and, when these flight plans are filed, the pilots or the air crew are advised by this Military Co-ordination Centre of any areas to avoid. Some examples of a typical sort of thing were given earlier. If there is a concentration of caribou going through a portion of the training area, either on a migration or if it happens to be the calving season and the calving grounds are occupied, these are avoided. If we have information or reports about fishing or hunting camps that are occupied, those are marked on the maps and also are avoided.

The plans for the future, the proposals the Chairman has mentioned, the current users have indicated an interest in exanding their operations somewhat. This would primarily be an increase of aircraft. Up to each nation is allowed a maximum of 25 aircraft. I say allowed, there is an agreement that they have all signed, a Memorandum of Understanding, which limits the number of aircraft and personnel that each country can have in Goose Bay. So, there is an interest in increasing that activity.

As well, some other nations have indicated interest in conducting similar training activity at Goose Bay. Canada is presently negotiating with one of these countries, the Government of the Netherlands in Europe. No agreements have been signed or finalized at this time but the Dutch hope to do a small training operation next year of 10 to 12 aircraft.

Any additional nations that did come to train at Goose Bay would have to sign and become party to that Memorandum of Understanding that I mentioned earlier, which governs all the flying activity there.

The other proposal that has been mentioned, and I emphasize at this time that it is a proposal only. Yes, there has been lobbying for it. That is the sort of thing that happens when any kind of a proposal comes up in industry or a related kind of field. Canada -- that is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, as it is called. Very briefly, NATO, which consists of 16 participating nations in Europe, is looking for an area to do a wide variety of training on their fighter aircraft. At present, training areas are extremely limited in Europe, in size and in the number of aircraft that they can handle at any one time. The requirements, however, for air crew to train and learn how to properly use their modern aircraft, the demands are there, the needs are there. So, they are looking for an area.

Two areas have been offered. One is Goose Bay, on behalf of Canada, and the other is a location in the country of Turkey called Conia. These two sites were surveyed last year by a NATO-appointed working group and they have compiled reports, made an evaluation of the most suitable site, in their opinion, and they have made a recommendation to NATO at the beginning of September, this past month, of a most suitable site. That recommendation will continue through a review process until December of this year when the NATO ministerial body will make -- we assume will make, if there are no delays -- their final selection of the most suitable site.

On completion of that selection or that decision, there remains a two-year period where the host country would enter a series of negotiations, detailed planning, design of the training centre, et cetera. During that negotiation and planning period, should any major obstacle be encountered that is not possible to overcome, then the NATO body would, on the approval of the NATO ministerial body, the working group would then return to the alternate site, review that and enter negotiations with that country.

To give you a brief idea of the sort of activities that would occur in the NATO Training Centre -- and there is quite a wide variety. I will try not to be technical about it -- there would be some low level flying similar to what is done at the present time, that is low level navigation training, reconnaissance training, tactical manoeuvering of aircraft, some weapons delivery and the weapons would be both practice weapons and possibly live weapons. A number of ranges have been -- an optimum number have been suggested by the working group as being required. There would be electronic warfare training, which really involves equipment on the aircraft and equipment that would be on the ground, all electronic equipment. There would be anti-shipping or anti-Maritime training, which would be against ships out in the ocean. That is a desirable feature, it is not an essential one. In connection with that, there would be possibly the establishment of a sea range. Some people may have heard reference to that. The sea range is merely an area in which a ship can tow a target at which aircraft can fire various kinds of weapons.

There might be a requirement for air-to-air gunnery range. That would be most likely over the ocean because of the problems of establishing one of those over land. The area underneath has to be totally free of any people, in effect sterile. That would be difficult to do in Labrador. There would be air-to-air combat, which is normally done from medium to high altitudes, sometimes involving supersonic flight. Last but not least, there would occasionally be possibly what we call flag exercises. They call them that because they are based on two major training centres that do this kind of training: One is in the States and one is in Canada in Cold Lake, Alberta. The flag exercises involve a large number of aircraft at one time doing all different kinds of roles. That could also occur from time to time.

I mentioned live weapons. Since the establishment or the initial study of the Centre in 1981, when they spent two years coming up with a basic idea of the Centre, a lot of technological changes have occurred. Today there exists a system which is called a no-drop bomb scoring system. It is an electronic system which enables a pilot or an air crew to conduct a full mission and receive scores on his attack, if you like, on a target without anything coming off the airplane. No bombs are dropped. That has two main advantages in that it protects the environment and also, of course, saves money in cost of the weapons.

The NATO Centre that has been established as a general idea by the working group, as I mentioned earlier in my presentation this afternoon, is very much an optimum facility. It is an ideal facility. Such things as funding profiles, where the money is coming from, et cetera, have not been established.

I think we are all aware, in this day and age, there are all sorts of economic cutbacks in many, many countries. Military exercises, military plans are not exempt from those cutbacks. It may well occur that in the planning and design of this NATO Centre, they may have to have a scaled down version of it. That, obviously, would result in a lower level of activity and a lower level of any socio-economic benefits that might accrue from the project.

The Centre, hopefully, will become operational in the early 1990's, so it is a little ways down the road. That is barring any delays. If there are delays that come up, then it would be even longer before it starts.

Just in closing, of interest to residents, possibly, in this area, any kind of military flying training requires the establishment of what we call alternate airfields. These are used primarily in the case of emergencies for the aircraft or if an aircraft has to divert from its home base because of bad weather. Goose Bay is particularly in need of these airfields, as it is in itself quite isolated.

The NATO working group, with reference to the Fighter Weapons Training Centre, has taken under consideration in its initial survey three potential locations: Churchill Falls, Wabush and Schefferville. The reason they have selected those is because they are looking, in their initial view of this study, at what we call the northern training areas. That is where they envisage establishing the NATO Centre. Again, that is all subject to change when it gets down to the planning phase.

If these airfields were established as alternate airfields, it would involve such things as upgrading of the actual airfield facility, such as extension of the runways, possibly a refuelling systems upgrade and maybe some accommodations.

I think I would like to just terminate there, Mr. Chairman. I think I have given a basic idea. I would certainly welcome any questions on my presentation and anything else that I might be able to comment on. I pass that over to the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

I see a hand at the back already. Yes, we will entertain questions for Major McCabe. I would ask you to go, in turn, to one of the floor microphones and to please state your name clearly before you speak. When you do speak, please do not speak too quickly because we are attempting to interpret what you say for those who do not understand the language that you are speaking. Please go ahead.

MR. J.C. deMONTIGNY: My name is J.C. deMontigny. I am a Chief Pilot, Multi-Engine Operations, Air Schefferville.

I would like to talk in my name and in the names of the other pilots around in single operations to Major McCabe. Let us put aside, for my part, the environment problems and all the problems that we have discussed before. I am concerned -- we are all concerned about the security business for the airplanes flying around because, as you know, Major, all these hunting and fishing businesses which brings the other problems we have been talking about, involves quite a lot of flying, especially during that season and it is also all low level flying. Even our multi-engine operation involves Twin Otter flying, which is a small operation, very low level, and the other airplanes flying on floats, which are the types you know about. They are all going to the same places where the caribou live because they are related directly to hunting or fishing or to carry these -- when we talk about Indians -- carry them in and out of the woods. So, it means that you have pilots flying all over the place, from the Atlantic coast right to pretty much west of Schefferville here, at the same time that your military activity would take place.

My question is: After myself having had a couple of encounters of -- I do not know what kind, it is quite obvious that if I fly down the river with an airplane, an airplane which is not as manoeuverable as your airplanes are and very slow, if ever one of these things goes down the same river or the same valley at low altitudes, what exactly is the evasive action for your aircraft? Security-wise, are we protected, because I am talking about quite a big amount of airplanes flying around. Just go to the sea plane base and take an account during one day of the airplane movement there, and you will have quite a surprise. That is just for one company. We are only one permanent operator around but you also have operators here for part of the year.

So, if you talk about security, could you -- I will finish my question right there -- tell me how we are protected as low level flyers? Thank you.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Once again, I will not get technical but, if the public will bear with me as I am talking a pilot to another pilot, I might point out (a) your concerns are very much of concern to ourselves for obvious reasons. We are in those airplanes as well. It does not matter where you fly, when you are flying visual flight rules, as you well know -- I am not telling you how to fly, you understand what I am saying -- visual flight rules work primarily on see and be seen, particularly in uncontrolled air space. That is something that we all have to live with.

I can assure you, as a fighter pilot myself, when you are travelling at nine or 10 miles a minute, you have to learn, you have to be trained how to anticipate a little quicker than possibly someone in a Single Otter or Twin Otter. That comes with time. We are taught to look ahead, we do take evasive action when we see aircraft and sometimes we do not. But then, again, that can happen between civil aircraft. That does happen, one does not expect to see it so much in this kind of terrain because it is so much a wilderness. You obviously do not have large commercial flight or a lot of weekend pilots, et cetera, that are in the more populated areas.

As far as the security, again we can do what we can at present. Part of that ties in with trying to find out which camps are occupied, in a sense, or are active, the established ones. The Military Co-ordination Centre, as I mentioned earlier, will make reference to those, will indicate them to the pilots and they mark them on their maps. If there is a conflict with their route, they are supposed to change that.

Now, obviously, these people are professionals, they know that if that camp is active or a series of ca mps, there is going to be aircraft associated with that. Some of the allied users have from time to time made a request that certain portions of the low level flying area be restricted to civilian flying. We have categorically denied that, as far as we are concerned it is out of the question. We have no intention nor do we want to get into that kind of military flying area only where civilian pilots would not be able to fly. It is a large air space out there and we feel that, if it is handled professionally, we can cope with it. That is not to say that there will not be incidents and that is probably not very reassuring to you.

I would suggest that something that might be an idea in the future and that ties in with the recommendation that was made earlier this year is that a toll-free number be established at the Co-ordinatio Centre where people like yourselves could phone up and let people know there that, hey, we are going to be flying in this area. We have the maps down there. It allows us, in turn, to give a heads-up to the military pilots. As well, if you are going down deep into that area, you might want to use the same system and ask what kind of flying training do you guys have scheduled today. It is a reciprocal kind of thing. It does not exist right now but I think it is one possibility.

Again, we need the co-operation of people like yourselves to let us know what kind of activities you do, what time of year. The more information we get, the better able we are to protect you people. I think that is a common goal there.

Does that answer your question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else care to put a question to Major McCabe? Well, if not, the thank you, Major, very much for your presentation.

At this time I think I would like to call for a short break, a very short break. I will insist on making it short but I think we could all us a little break at this time. Let us say five minutes, after which we will resume. I have been advised of two presentations which are to follow. Thank you.

---Short Recess

---Upon Resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: We were to hear next fro

a representative of the Town of Schefferville. However, the gentleman does not appear to be in the room at the moment. I have sent someone off to look for him. I will wait a moment longer.

I understand he has arrived. We are to hear from Mr. Gilles Poirier, Councillor of the Town of Schefferville.

---SOUMISSION PAR M. GILLES POIRIER: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires, mon nom est Gilles Poirier, conseiller à la ville de Schefferville.

Au nom de la ville de Schefferville et peut-être aussi à témoin des représentants des pourvoyeurs du Nouveau Québec, je tiens à déplorer le manque d'informations de la tenue des auditions de la Commission de l'Environnement à Schefferville.

On en a été avisé cet après-midi par un... je ne dirais pas un hasard, et puis on n'a pas eu le temps, dans un avenir, dans une prochaine Commission, on comparaîtra avec un mémoire qui représentera probablement plus l'avis de la population blanche et du Conseil de ville à ce moment-là.

Monsieur Martin nous avait assuré à un moment donné que la publicité entourant les auditions serait faite à la ville de Schefferville, ce qui n'a pas été fait. Et puis même, on aurait semblé indiquer qu'on pourrait défrayer les coûts de déplacement de différents intervenants. Je fais ici allusion à monsieur Alain Méthot qui est le représentant des pourvoyeurs du Nouveau Québec, qui n'en avait jamais eu vent avant cinq heures (5h00) ce soir.

Néanmoins, il reste dans la population

blanche et le Conseil de ville certaines interrogations ou des préoccupations qui nous... des choses qui nous préoccupent, dont qu'est-ce qu'on a à gagner de tout ça et qu'est-ce qu'on a à perdre.

Définitivement, pour la population indienne, ce qu'ils ont à perdre, c'est tout. Et puis je comprends très bien leur point de vue et les raisons qu'ils évoquent pour être contre tous ces essais ou ces opérations militaires.

Les blancs, qu'a-t-on à gagner? Si les blancs restent à Schefferville, comme il semble qu'ils peuvent rester, on a probablement, comme tous les indiens, beaucoup de choses à perdre, mais, devrait-il y avoir des opérations, comme il y en aura, comme il y en a eu, comme il y en aura ou ... comme il y en a eu aujourd'hui, hier et comme il y en aura demain, les autorités municipales, disons le Conseil de ville, ce n'est peut-être pas nécessairement le pouls de la population parce que la population n'en a pas été informée et puis elle se préoccupe très peu de ces choses-là, si tel est le voeu du gouvernement canadien d'avoir... et des Forces armées d'avoir des opérations militaires dans la région, le monde des affaires et la population blanche probablement verraient d'un bon oeil les retombées économiques, ici, localement.

Soumission, Poirier

Ici, je ne veux pas engager une polémique avec la population indienne qui a tout à perdre, comme je disais.

Mais la population blanche, je me suis laissé dire qu'elle verrait d'un bon oeil certaines installations, certaines infra-structures et puis d'autant plus que notre population blanche, ici à Schefferville n'a plus les apports financiers que la compagnie Iron Ore pouvait avoir dans le passé.

Advenant qu'il y ait des préjudices subis par l'occupation ou l'utilisation de notre territoire québécois, spécialement ceux des pourvoyeurs, préjudices qui pourraient être une perte d'achalandage, mais là je ne veux pas m'embarquer dans les représentations que les pourvoyeurs vous feront par écrit ou personnellement lors d'une séance ultérieure, on sait très bien qu'il y a des préjudices que définitivement les pouvoyeurs peuvent avoir. Surtout d'après les chasseurs qu'ils ont eu à transporter.

Des retombées économiques locales; rappelons que Schefferville possède encore une voie ferrée, des services municipaux et un aéroport et qu'elle serait fort probablement heureuse d'accueillir des investissements majeurs.

À défaut de ces investissements majeurs là - je parle d'investissements majeurs et non pas simplement des préjudices d'avions qui viennent nous passer au-dessus de la tête là - à défaut d'investissements majeurs, la ville et les différents intervenants s'opposeront définitivement à toute présence militaire dans notre région.

Les pourvoyeurs y voient un préjudice. Si on a simplement les préjudices... On ne peut concevoir que les investissements soient faits au Labrador et puis que les activités militaires soient au Québec. Pensons aux retombées économiques certaines du Labrador, versus l'utilisation de notre territoire sans retombée économique. Ça, définitivement, on aura sûrement une petite rencontre avec notre premier ministre pour lui expliquer ces choses-là.

Je souligne les grandes lignes d'un mémoire qui sera présenté à la Commission par écrit ou d'autres représentations à une rencontre ultérieure.

Encore une fois, à cause du manque de communication de la tenue de votre Commission, la représentation est brève, mais je pense qu'elle peut résumer les grandes lignes des préoccupations de la population blanche ici à Schefferville.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

In connection with the lack of prior notice about the meeting, we do regret it is unfortunate. It happened, through an oversight at the office which supports our activities, neither the Town of Schefferville nor the Outfitters Association got on our regular mailing list. We apologize for this and we hope that we can make up for this, at least in part, by offering you, both the Town and the Outfitters Association, an opportunity to come before us at one of the other locations in this series of meetings.

For example, that could be at North West River during the week after next or it might be in Montreal on October the 20th. You could have your choice of either of those or perhaps some other location. Please feel free to discuss this with the Members of our Secretariat to make the arrangements and we would gladly arrange to pay the travelling and associated expenses for perhaps two or three representatives in each case.

Now, the final presentation, of which I have been advised for this evening, is the presentation on behalf of Naskapi people and I understand that the Chief of Band Council, Chief Joe Guanish, wishes to speak to us.

For the benefit of our interpreters in the boothes at the back of the room, I understand that the Chief will be assisted by another person, who is going to provide consecutive interpretation to the floor.

---Chief Joe Guanish's Submission as interpreted by Sampson Einish

---SUBMISSION BY SAMSON EINISH: The Chief would like to thank the Chairman and Members of the Panel for giving the Chief the opportunity to make a presentation. Also, he is very glad that today the population is here to assist this hearing.

The Naskapi Band of Quebec are concerned about the military flight training that is taking place in the Labrador and Quebec regions. Also, the Naskapis still maintain and exercise, the traditional ways of their ancestors, of hunting, fishing and trapping within the areas of the Quebec and Labrador regions. Also, that we have legitimate rights within the areas where this flight training is occurring at the same time, since the Naskapis, along with the Montagnais and the Inuit and other Native people, exercise their traditional activities within those areas.

We fully believe, to maintain and to exercise our traditional ways as it was the means of our ancestors in the past, such as hunting, fishing and trapping within the Labrador and northern part of Quebec. We regret fully the attitude that the federal government took, without having a proper consultation process between the Native people, prior to establishing this initiative of this immense operation. As at present, there has been lack of a consultation process where the environmental impact of the low level flying of the military aircraft affects not only the environment but also the wildlife and the environment.

Towards the environmental impact that has occurred, since this initiative has been in progress, we have already been given substantial information that has been released of how caribou herds and other species have been predominantly affected with this operation. That not only affects our environment but also the wildlife that we depend on. Mainly, not only depended on by the Native people but by other non-Indians.

At present it is very hard to determine the factors towards the environmental impact and what will occur in the future of how the wildlife is affected because, if the wildlife is affected in the environment, the human beings will also be affected. Whether it will obstruct their health, the extinction of the species, even the fauna or the environment itself.

The Chief says he has already witnessed certain herds of caribou that migrated from northern Labrador to the area that reached the vicinity of our hunting areas. At present, the way the Naskapis have witnessed it, the caribou are not in a very healthy state, it is inedible and it is not a healthy caribou, like the way it was supposed to have been. Every year there was a season when caribou was very healthy. The caribou migrating from the northern parts of Quebec, since the Chief says he assisted the hunting expedition, the health of the caribou was very good and very excellent. It would be good to kill, compared with the other ones that were not in a very good state. Probably what really affected caribou herds in the Newfoundland area was this operation.

There was a caribou feast that was organized by our community and there were men that were sent within the various hunting areas near the vicinity of Labrador where the hunters killed caribou that migrated within their areas of Labrador. They were not very good physically and they were inedible, which might have occurred because of the incident of this operation that is affecting the health and the environment of the wild species.

Also, in the past, the caribou herds have never been in a situation where they had to experience hearing the noise and the low-flying altitude of an aircraft, especially when it emits a sound which bothers the herd. In the past, that never occurred, which is also is a factor of caribou being affected drastically.

Even though it has been said that, supposedly, there is going to be a greater herd, the gestation period it is going to be very difficult for the caribou to be able to produce normally, as done in the past, because of these occurrences of having these military aircraft soaring over their migrating areas. Not only the aspect of the greater herd should be taken into consideration but also smaller herds where it occurs that some groups of caribou disperse from the larger herd. Supposedly, when the small herd is on a gestation period, these are going to be seriously affected, especially, maybe, the health of the new born or yet to be born calves.

Not only the caribou is going to be affected but also the birds and the fish. Supposedly, for the birds, there is going to be a season when they are going to be hatching their eggs. Supposedly, once they are affected by this low-flying aircraft and all this, they might hatch their eggs earlier than what it was anticipated of the normal course of hatching the eggs. Even for the caribou, supposedly there is a certain period when it is calving, this might affect the caribou to have a gestation period earlier than is normal. For the fish, from the exhaust coming out of the jet fighters, it may affect the water, the abundance of the water while the fish are spawning. This would affect this kind of environment when it comes to exhaust fumes and even various operations that are going to be carried out in these specific areas.

Supposedly, this operation is going to be obtained on a year round basis and, when the climate is not very favourable and there is a herd of caribou and we have these military planes soaring over their heads, it will certainly bother them for sure because of the sound or of the noise these military planes make. It is not only going to affect the herd but it is also going to confuse them or disorientate them of the areas that they are travelling. What you have to take into consideration is the fact that there are several migratory routes of the caribou within the Labrador and Quebec regions.

The government anticipated that the area where this military operation is being established is an isolated area. There is broader space to carry out these military operations in the nature of having the low level flight training. What should be taken into consideration is the fact that there are Native people living around here, at the same time we have the outfitting operations that exist within the boundaries of Labrador and Quebec, and also that these outfitting operations may be disrupted. To the extent of increasing or establishing this type of military operation, it may also affect the Native people within communities or wherever their hunting grounds are.

Due to the increase of the military operations and its impact, we are pretty aware of the fact that so much area has been designated where these military operations should be carried out but sometimes they are being extended. There are two primary areas within the Quebec and Labrador region. Despite the fact that since these operations for the commercial flights -- we have the commercial companies here for the flights, they, too, have been taken into consideration towards the fact that maybe in the future, should the Naskapis buy this commercial business out, Air Schefferville service, it will affect not only the flying but also affect the areas where, primarily, the normal commercial flights should be taken.

It is not only the Native people that shall be affected with this military operation but also the non-Indians on the basis of the fact that we, the Native people, maintain our traditional ways but, at the same time, we have the non-Indians exercising also this caribou harvest. Also, there is the tourist operations here, the outfitting operations, where we have many non-Indians coming from various parts of the world to have an experience of the outdoor life. Those are going to be affected economically-wise. It is going to be affecting all people, not only the Native people.

First of all, major developments have occurred within the northern Quebec region, such as the mining operations that have been operational in the past, then it was the James Bay Hydro-Electric development that has occurred where the Native people have not much say or participation economically or politically. On the aspect now that we have this new initiative coming around where the Native people do not have much say or input to be able to fully participate towards this intiative and the government is the only one who seems to be pulling the strings or having its own say and then creating intiatives not primarily for the benefit of the Native people.

Also, the federal government has to take into full consideration the commitment that the government made towards the signing of the James Bay Agreement and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement where there were certain moralities that have to be respected by the government. The federal government did not mention within the northern Quebec region of the 55th parallel for this military operation to occur within the Quebec region. It is specified clearly in the Agreement that there has to be a formal consultation process carried out, should there be any major new developments occur within the areas of our primary interest, above the 55th parallel, in respect to the fact that they are both agreements that have been signed by the federal/provincal governments and the Native parties.

Because of the reason within the Northeastern Quebec Agreement or James Bay Agreement, the promoter has to come up with the general description of the project, the environmental impact it shall have within the territorial limit of the 55th parallel in order that there should be an evaluation of what are going to be the consequential affects it will have on the territories related towards this operation. That is why we feel that various studies should be taken, such as on the wildlife, such as the caribou, the fish and the environment itself.

It is highly recommendable that comprehensive research should be done towards the environmental impact that this military operation shall have towards the environment, the species and the humans, how it will affect the health of the individuals and of the wildlife. In this aspect, we are a bit reticent to believe that nothing worse may come out of these military operations affecting our land, the wildlife and the plantation.

Also, there has to be a study on the potential areas where this military operation shall be carried out. Supposedly, they are territories that are highly respected by the Native people such as the hunting grounds and other territories that may have been anticipated by the future development of the Native people where this military operation might affect the lands that were anticipated to other use for the benefit of the Native people.

In the near future it is very highly recommendable that, those who are involved in realizing this project, they should determine specific areas where, supposedly, there might be archeological research that has to be done on certain areas where some of our ancestors are buried or some areas where we would consider that it would be viable economically to the Native people. So, in the sense that before the military operations should occur in one specific area, it has to be determined first whether there is going to be a usage by the Native people. What we are saying is before any military operation occurs in one specific area, they should ask the Native people whether that area should be used for that particular purpose, unless the Native people do not have means to use that economically or for other pertinent uses.

It is quite understandable that it is for the defence of Canada that this operation wants to be established or will be established but, at the same time, you are gradually destroying the environment and affecting the wildlife and you are gradually killing out the traditional ways of the Native people. You are trying to defend the lives of the Native people but, at the same time, you are gradually doing away with the environment, the wildlife and the other species that have been highly regarded by the Native people. Also, in the future, probably the health of not only the Native people but non-Native people shall be affected.

Before the federal government should really proceed and envisage extending and improving the military operations as of the present, it would be highly recommended that the federal government should establish or develop a document that would be provided to the Native people and to other interested parties and having a referendum within Labrador and within the Province of Quebec; whether there would be Native people or other people that are for the project of this immensity or if there are those who are against, opposed to having these military activities. That way -- because the government always comes around when it comes to elections and then they always have the normal elections where government is being voted in -- it ensures the protection of the rights of the Native people and also the rights of others. I think it should be a legitimate right to express our desire and to exercise our freedom of telling the government whether we are opposed to this operation or whether we are for it. That way there would be participation by the Native people and this would give a clear indication to the government where the Native people stand in relation to this military operation.

For the Naskapis Council Band of Quebec, the move that they are going to make is that they are going to have a meeting with other Native people of Quebec, such as the Montagnais people and other Native people, in order to develop one common ground of where the Native people stand, if they are opposed to this military operation being established or being continued. That way we will have one common ground and one common say of what the aspirations and the desires of the Native people are in Quebec.

Since the years of 1941, in the years of post-war and during the war, there have been serious consequences of how the Native people are being affected economically, especially the Naskapi people. The Chief states he will provide the information to everybody, even to the media, of how the Naskapis were really affected during that time and how they anticipate the negative impact it shall have upon the Native people again, should this military operation of this immensity be encouraged without later consideration of what shall take place in the future, how it will affect the environment, the wildlife and the human beings, such as the Native people, non-Native people and all the communities in the vicinity of this military operation.

The Chief would like to thank you all for listening. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

I have no more names on my list but I would like to ask if anyone else would like to come forward and speak to the Panel, even though you have not indicated your desire to do so before now. Please feel free to stand up, identify yourself and say whatever you would like to say.

---SOUMISSION PAR M. AURALIEN GILL: Un comentaire, ce serait peut-être une question suite à certains commentaires, peut-être j'aurais une question à vous poser.

J'ai pris note de la réponse sur le mandat que vous aviez à l'effet que c'était évidemment de tenir des audiences pour savoir qu'est-ce que le public pensait, pour minimiser l'impact des vols militaires sur les populations et l'environnement.

Maintenant, je pense que tout le monde a été témoin des doléances, des commentaires que les indiens ont faits ici à Schefferville, probablement aussi à Romaine il n'y a pas tellement longtemps. Vous allez continuer à vous promener à travers le Québec et le Labrador.

Évidemment que les réponses et les commentaires vont différer d'un endroit à l'autre. Montréal, probablement que ça va différer - des intérêts différents. Ici, les gens du nord ont des intérêts particuliers au territoire du nord parce que ce sont des gens qui connaissent le territoire du nord, qui vivent, qui dépendent du territoire du nord, qui dépendent de ses ressources et qui ont énormément de préoccupations. Il faut comprendre aussi que l'organisation ou les organisations indiennes en particulier n'ont pas toutes les ressources que les autres organismes peuvent avoir à travers le pays.

Entre autres, par exemple cet après-midi si vous avez vu circuler un petit peu ici dans la salle, c'est parce que le Conseil Attikamek Montagnais était pris avec un autre problème qui se passait à Saint-Augustin, entre autres où cinq (5) personnes étaient arrêtées pour avoir tué des oiseaux migrateurs pour nourrir leur famille.

Et si le chef de Saint-Augustin est avec nous ce soir, c'est parce que la Police montée ne sait pas qu'il est ici parce qu'il y a un mandat d'amenée contre lui pour avoir tué des oiseaux migrateurs.

Alors, c'est ce qui se passe dans le nord.

Alors, ce que je veux dire tout simplement, c'est que j'ai bien compris, j'ai bien noté que vous avez dit que votre Commission n'était pas là pour... à savoir si vous deviez recommander d'arrêter les vols militaires ou de les continuer. C'était pour essayer de diminuer les impacts.

Je me demande si dans votre mandat, il est exclu, par exemple étant donné les circonstances, étant donné le manque d'organisation que les gens du nord peuvent avoir, les indiens peuvent avoir, je me demande s'il est exclu de votre mandat la possibilité d'avoir un certain moratoire pour permettre aux gens de faire valoir vraiment leurs opinions, vraiment leurs sentiments concernant les ressources du nord qui, en fait, ont des conséquences énormes sur le futur et les générations qui vont venir.

Je sais que vous avez une grande responsabilité sur le dos, c'est de faire des recommandations au gouvernement à l'effet de... pour le futur. Et je me demande si votre Commission ne pourrait pas songer, par exemple, à voir si dans son mandat ça ne lui serait pas permis de donner du temps aux gens qui sont les premiers concernés, les premiers touchés, pour être capable d'exprimer davantage et de véhiculer réellement leurs sentiments et leurs commentaires.

Alors, c'est la question que je vous pose, monsieur le président, et si vous pouviez la considérer... Je comprends que vous n'êtes pas mandaté pour faire les recommandations au gouvernement, pour dire que les vols militaires doivent arrêter, j'ai compris ça cet après-midi, vous l'avez répété deux (2) fois je pense. Vous n'êtes pas mandaté pour ça. Cependant, étant donné les circonstances, je me demande si votre Commission ne pourrait pas interpréter son mandat pour permettre aux gens d'avoir le temps et la chance de faire valoir leurs doléances et ce qu'ils pensent sur le projet.

Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wilkinson has just asked me if it might not be advisable to call for a short break in the meeting, so that the entire Panel can discuss within itself the answer that we may want to provide to that question at the present time. If that would be agreeable with everyone at the meeting, I would ask for a five minute break and, at the end of that break, I will provide an answer that has been discussed by the entire Panel.

---Short recess

---Upon Resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: Be seated, please.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Panel has discussed the question. We have recalled that a few questions were put to the Panel in La Romaine and we expect that there may be other questions put to us at some of the other locations in this series of meetings which will continue on until the end of October. We feel that, rather than attempt to provide quick answers to questions of this sort on the spot in these meetings, we should carry through with the entire series of meetings noting the questio that we are asked and, after the meetings are over when the Panel meets in November to discuss the preparation of the final form of the Guidelines that I spoke about earlier. At that time we would consider all of these questions at the same time, reach a conclusion on each one and, in due course after that, provide answers to all of the questions by means of some sort of public notice. I think that that would probably give us a means of dealing fairly with all of the questions because I am sure there are more to be asked yet. So, that is our response to that question at the present time.

Would anyone else like to come forward and either make a statement or ask a question? If not, then I suppose it is time to bring the meeting to a close. Before I do, I would like to sincerely thank each and every person who has come forward at this meeting here in Schefferville, both Native people and white people. In particular, I would like to thank the more elderly members of the community who have come forward and spoken to us. Please believe me when I say that we are very happy to hear from each and every one of you.

As we proceed through this review, I am sure we are going to hear a great deal of information from people who are in favour of this proposal and from people who are not in favour of this proposal. We promise to try our very best to work over all of this information in our minds and come up with the best possible recommendations that we could make to the Government of Canada concerning this project.

You have made us feel very welcome here in Schefferville. I thank all of you for your hospitality. I would like to thank also the Members of the Secretariat to the Panel who have arranged for all of our transportation and all that sort of thing while we have been here. Thanks also to the interpreters who have worked very hard throughout the meeting and to the reporters, whom I have not mentioned before but who are sitting over at the table on my right, and who will, in very short order, be providing a written transcript of this meeting for us to study very carefully. Again, thank you to all of you.

Having said all of that, I would declare the meeting closed. Thank you very much. Before you leave, I would ask you to pass in the translation receivers and I have also been advised that the Montagnais people would like to provide us with some sort of social event. So, please feel free to proceed with that whenever you wish.

---Whereupon the Hearing adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Volume

3

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	GOOSE BAY	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 1, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	3	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO—OTTAWA—WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
B. WATTS	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Anglican Parish Hall, Grenfell Street,
Happy Valley-Goose Bay

DATE: October/octobre 1, 1986.

VOLUME: 3

OFFICIAL REPORTERS: Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.
PER: Eleanor Thomson

INDEX

	PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman	262
Presentation by Major McCabe	273
SUBMISSION/QUESTIONS BY:	
Susan Felsberg	286
Don Stewart	287
Penote Michel	287
Bruce Moores	298
Kevin Quinlan	295
Peter Bradford	300
Joy Pye-MacSwain	304

* * * * *

·1
ET:ET
Oct. 1

---Upon commencing at 7:15 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening, and welcome to the first of four sessions of our meetings here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay concerning the proposed military flying activites.

My name is David Barnes, and I am the Chairman of this Environment Assessment Panel that you see before you which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of Canada to conduct this public environment review of that probject.

Before beginning the meeting, there are a couple of important administrative matters that I have been asked to speak about.

First of all, you may have noticed a sign on the chalk board behind me. I have been asked to say that that sign if very important, and should be regarded very seriously. I would ask your cooperation in that. The prohibition on smoking pertains to the hallway outside, as well as to this room.

We will be having at least one, perhaps two short breaks this evening. Therefore, anyone who wishes to smoke can go outside and do so.

First I would like to introduce to you the members of our Panel. Starting on your left, at that end of the table, is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Paul is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant, established in Montreal, and has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the

Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

Next is Mr. Don Stewart. Don is retired. He lives in the Ottawa area and operates a small farm. Prior to his retirement, he was employed in the Canadian Armed Forces as a Brigadier-General. His last position was Deputy Commander of NORAD, which included responsibility for the training, equipping and maintaining and employment of U.S. and Canadian air defence forces in NORAD, and was in fact stationed in Goose Bay for a time.

Next to Don is Tim McNeill. Tim is a resident of Makkovik where he owns a small business. He is knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador, and was involved at one time in the provincial environmental review of the proposed Kitts Michelin Uranium Mine in Labrador.

On my left is Mrs. Beatrice Watts who, I am sure, is well known to just about everyone who lives around here.

Beatrice is Director of the Native Curriculum Center of Labrador which develops textbooks in Native languages. She comes originally from Nain, and is a former Mayor of North West River. In that capacity, I should imagine she gained a fair amount of knowledge of municipal interests in this area. She was a member of the National Status of Women Council in 1983-84, and has also been involved with Labrador Legal Services, which provides court

D-3

assistance for Native people.

Next to Beatrice is Mr. William Jourdain, a Montagnais Indian from Sept-Iles. He has been active in band affairs, and has been administrative director of a shopping centre in Sept-Iles, where he lives. He also worked for the Iron Ore Company for 20 years and is now retired.

On the other end of the table is a person who may be well known to some of you, Mr. Tom Northcott. Tom is a biologist with extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador. He is Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resource questions. Previously he was a research biologist with the wildlife division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office in Ottawa, where I am the Director for the Atlantic Region. So that is what I do when I am not here acting as Chairman of this Panel.

I have been with that office for about one year. Before that I was employed with the Newfoundland Department of Environment where I was involved in the development of the provincial environment assessment process.

The Panel is also fortunate to be supported by a three-person Secretariat, and I would like to identify each of those three persons for you

-4

and ask them to stand so you can see them. The Executive Secretary of the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon, at the back of the room, and Mr. Jim Clarke, at the very back of the room.

These three people very ably carry out activities like arranging our itineraries, arranging for transportation, and arranging for charter aircraft when we miss our commercial flights and that sort of thing because of weather conditions. All together, we could not get along without them.

In particular, why I have identified them for you, if you wish at any time to learn more about the environmental assessment and review process which we are involved in here, and would like, for example, to obtain copies of publications issued by the federal office on the subject, and related matters, I would ask you to speak to any of these gentlemen and they can arrange to have whatever you want sent to you as soon as possible.

Also present at the meeting tonight is a lady who has been engaged by our office to operate our Information Office here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay for the duration of the review. I am referring to Carolyn Maybee. The people in the local area are fortunate that you have an extension of our office here, so it is easy for you to go to Carolyn and obtain information on the review at any time you wish during the hours when the office is open.

D-5

We did issue a notice indicating the locations and dates and time of all the meetings in this series. In that notice we asked that anyone who wished to appear at any of these meetings and speak to the Panel should contact the Secretariat in advance, and put their names on a list.

We have not had an overwhelming response to that request, and I suspect there may be some people here this evening who wish to get up and say something.

Therefore, at a certain point in the proceedings I will call a break when those of you who wish to speak to us tonight can go to Mr. Jim Clarke and give him your name and the name of the organization you represent, if that is the case, and then we will be able to see who wishes to speak tonight, how many of you there are, and we can allocate the time accordingly.

I would like to make sure that we all understand a bit about the process of this review: why we are here this evening; why we have asked you to come along and speak to us.

What I would like to do is outline the review for you in six steps. At the end of this if you have any questions or need clarification, I will glad to answer.

By way of background, the reason why there is a review going on is that in 1974 the Government of Canada decided that it wanted to change

)-6

and improve the process of decision-making on major resource development projects for which the Government of Canada is responsible in one way or another. In particular the government wished to undertake a greater degree of public consultation than was going on before that time. For this purpose, there was established a process known as the Environmental Assessment and Review Process under which two things happen. First of all, there is a self-assessment phase in which the federal department responsible for the particular project in question is required to do an internal examination of its proposal according to certain criteria established by the federal Environment Assessment Office in cooperation with the other departments in which they attempt to determine whether the proposed project is likely to have serious environmental impacts, or is likely to cause serious concern amongst the public. If the answer to either of those questions in yes, then it is the responsibility of that department, which is called the initiating department in our terminology, to write to the Minister of Environment and ask for a public environmental review conducted by a panel. And that is exactly what happened in this case.

The beginning of step one in the case of this review occurred in February of 1986 when the Minister of Environment received a letter from the Department of National Defence describing a proposal for military flying activities, and asking the Minister to appoint a panel to conduct a review.

In that referral document, as it is called, there was also set out a suggested scope for the review. That formed the basis for the development of the mandate of this panel, known as the Terms of Reference.

Step number two began with the actual appointment of the panel in July of this year. The panel was appointed by the Minister of the Environment, and the Terms of Reference,which has been worked out between the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence, were given to the Panel, and I should clarify that a little too. The proposal consisted of two basic parts: First of all, there is on-going low level flight training activity which has been going on for at least five or six years involving activities by several of the member nations of NATO, under agreements which are called bi-lateral agreements between each of those countries respectively, and the Government of Canada.

It was also pointed out in the referral document that it is quite likely that one or more additional countries may sign agreements with Canada on the same sort of basis, and begin similar flight training activities, based in Goose Bay.

The other part of the project is a proposal to establish a NATO Technical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay which would involve a

D-8

variety of activities including low level flying, and which will be described for you later this evening.

I am pointing this out because the Terms of Reference of the Panel are different with respect to those two different parts of the project. In the case of the on-going flying activities, the Panel has been asked to examine any information concerning environmental impacts resulting from those activities, and to make recommendations, for example, concerning remedial measure which might need to be undertaken to offset any harmful impact of those on-going activities, or to look fairly at the situation to enhance any beneficial impact which may be occurring.

The Panel does not have the mandate to recommend to the government that these existing flight training activities be terminated. It is important to understand that.

With regard to the proposed establishment of the training centre for NATO, the situation is different. There the Panel does have a mandate not only to recommend remedial measures concerning environmental impacts, but also if it saw fit, to recommend whether the Centre should be established or not.

Still in step two of the process then, during the spring and summer, staff of the federal Environmental Assessment office held preliminary meetings,which we called scoping workshops, with agencies of the federal, provincial and municipal

D-9

governments involved, also with representatives of Native people, to discuss what appeared to be the issues arising from the review of this project. The Panel took the results of those meetings, examined for itself what appeared to be the issues, and in August of this year issued a document called Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Those Guidelines, in their final form, will be the instructions to the Department of National Defence for the preparation of that Environmental Impact Statement, which is entirely their responsibility.

Therefore, the issuance of those Guidelines in August of this year ended step two of the process.

Step three is where we are now. We are holding public meetings during September and October in approximately 16 or 17 locations. The main purpose of these meetings being to receive comment on that draft document. The Panel wants to make sure that the document is as good as it can possibly be before it is put into final form and delivered to the Department of National Defence.

When we finish these meetings, at the end of October, the Panel will meet privately during November, it will go over all the information we have received in these meetings and will modify the draft as necessary into the final Guidelines. Those Guidelines will then be presented to National Defence,

D-10

we expect, in December of this year. That is the end of step three.

Step four is the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement by the Department of National Defence, at their cost. In that process they will review existing information, and they will conduct new studies as may be necessary, and they will write the report. The Environmental Impact Statement will be presented to the Panel probably in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

Step five will consist of examination of the Environmental Impact Statement, and the holding of hearings on the project. The Impact Statement will be made public as soon as it is received by the Panel, and so will be available to both the public and to the Panel and the governments for examination probably during the summer and early fall of 1987.

If necessary at that time, the Panel may go back to the Department of National Defence and ask for additional information if it identifies any deficiency areas in the Impact Statement. When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is that it has met the Guidelines issues previously by the Panel, the Panel will announce public hearings to discuss the project. The most likely time for those hearings to be held is the fall of 1987.

The final, the sixth step in the process, will be the preparation of a report by the Panel

D-11

itself. The Panel will examine all the information gathered in various ways during the review, and will write a report in which it will discuss the project, the expected impacts on both the natural environment and on the social and cultural environment, and examine the possible remedies that may have been suggested in the Impact Statement or by any other parties.

The report will also contain recommendations concerning the two main components of the proposal, as I described earlier, and the report will be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence some time in late 1987 or early 1988, according to our tentative schedule.

Are there any questions on that outline of the review, before I go on? I should mention now if anyone has anything to say at any time, we would like you to use one of the microphones on the floor stands, and to identify yourself clearly before you speak.

There are two other people here tonight whom I would like to introduce to you. One is the lady sitting at the table over on my left. In case you are wondering what she is doing, this is Ms Thomson who is recording the proceedings here and who will eventually deliver to our office a transcript of this and all the other meetings in the series. I mention this because the transcripts of each of the

D-12

meetings will be available on request. For example the transcript of these meetings in Goose Bay should be available in perhaps two or three weeks from this date. Like all of the other information being presented to the Panel in this review, it is public and is available for the asking merely by contacting our Secretariat in Ottawa, or by speaking to Carolyn Maybee in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

The other person I would like to introduce at this point is a representative of the Department of National Defence, Major David McCabe.

Major McCabe is here tonight for a very good reason. It is common practice with all panels of this type to invite a representative of the initiating department, sometimes called the proponent, to each of the public meetings, for the purpose of providing to the panel and to the public a descriptio of the project, and to answer questions concerning the nature of the project. This will be a brief description, and Major McCabe has indicated to me that he is in fact quite prepared to answer questions from anyone that subject.

Major, if you are ready, would you care to begin?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen. I would first like to thank you for giving me, as a representative of the proponent, the Department of National Defence, this opportunity to briefly explain the proposals which the Chairman has mentioned, and which are to be examined during the course of this study.

I should probably mention a bit of my own background, my credentials as it were, for my presence at these hearings.

I spent my first few years in the military at Goose Bay as an air traffic controller, and I have flown here on several occasions as a fighter pilot.

For the past two years, in Ottawa, I have been the project officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre working in the Directorate of Air Plans.

This summer I expanded my involvement somewhat to include all future plans and proposals connected with Goose Bay.

I will not occupy valuable time this evening by elaborating on the history of Goose Bay. I am quite sure that the people here know more about it than I do. I will just say that Goose Bay has seen a constant military presence at the airfield since it was built in 1941, albeit at various levels of activity. Since 1980 there has been a noticeable increase in military flying, specifically low-level flying. With the initial interest shown at that time by the German Air Force in commencing flying operations here, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low level flying activity which also included consideration of the requirement for practice target ranges.

The evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activities and was not intended to be an in-depth on-side study by specialists.

The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible. But as existing data on caribou was somewhat inconclusive, and at times contradictory, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established with reference to flying and the caribou.

In order to coordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Coordination Centre was established here in Goose Bay, at the airfield, in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Coordination Centre handles all local military flight plans, and advises air crews on a daily basis of local restrictions in the flying training area such as known caribou concentrations, and active fishing or hunting camps, when these are known.

The northern training area has been sub-divided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas, as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on maps for the air crew with a five nautical mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low flying aircraft.

In a further effort to better handle allied military flying activity at Goose Bay, Canada this year negotiated and signed a multi-national Memorandum of Understanding with each of the allied users. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which had existed in the past, and were known as bi-lateral agreements, between each allied user and several federal departments. Under the current agreement, the Canadian Forces are the sole agent for the control and coordination of allied military flying at Goose Bay. The agreement provides a definition of common use facilities which are equally cost-shared by all parties, and dedicated use facilities such as barracks and hangars which are funded entirely by the user.

As well, each user is limited in the number of aircraft and personnel which can be in Goose Bay at any one time.

Any other nation, incidentally, wishing to train at Goose Bay in a similar capacity, must become party to this Memorandum of Understanding.

Currently there are four signators to the agreement, these being the Air Forces of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level tactical flying activity. The Canadian Forces support the long range radar and the approach control radar facilities, and provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft. As well,

D-16

as of March of this, Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay. The United States Air Force continues its presence here primarily in the role of supporting transient transport aircraft. The Royal Air Force, although permitted, as mentioned in the agreement, up to approximately 25 aircraft, currently maintains nine Tornado fighter bombers during the flying season which typically runs from early March to the end of October. The German Air Force is somewhat closer to its limit of 25 aircraft, rotating between the Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets.

Current operations consist primarily of tactical missions of between two to four aircraft flying at a variety of altitudes down as low as 100 feet above the ground in designated areas, for usually one to one and one-half hours per mission. The mission usually entails navigation training, tactical manoeuvering and, on occasion, delivery of inert weapons on a practice target range. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminate devices which sometimes contain a small smoke charge to indicate impact point. Currently there is only one target range approved for use. It is situated in the southern low level training area, approximately 75 nautical miles from Goose Bay. It is a circle eight nautical miles in diameter, and in located in an open sandy area, previously burned out in a forest fire. The area is clearly marked with signs printed in English, French and two Native languages.

D-17

A second proposed target area is being examined in the northern training area, but it has not received final approval at this stage. Local interest groups are being consulted on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability to all concerned.

The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding. In conjunction with this proposed increase, some development of the southern practice target range is taking place. This includes development of a simulated airfield complex within that eight nautical mile area, and supporting facilities such as simulated surface-to-air missiles and operations centres. These are usually constructed of basic materials such as logs and plywood, and are meant to be replaced as required.

There is no intention at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Flying training by the current users will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying, and may include some limited night and poor weather flying. These latter two activities are designed to train air crews in the use of the terrain,following radar currently in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by current users, other nations have recently shown some interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Canada

-18 is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing training facilities at Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present, the Dutch hope to commence a partial season training program during the summer of 1987 flying F-16 fighters.

Initially for the first couple of years of the agreement of that training program, we anticipate 10 to 12 aircraft involved in training here, and approximately 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed at this time between the two governments.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay, is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give a brief background to the NATO training centre project.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO air forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe, with a concentration in Western Germany. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls, and to maintain the deterrent

D-19

effect of a well-trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked at the time to submit their training requirements, and based on these statistics a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility to cater to all the training requirements.

As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in a Phase I Report submitted to NATO in June of 1983. Two countries have since been offered as potential sites for location of the centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay, and Turkey has offered Conia Air Base.

Site surveys were conducted at each site last year, and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group to NATO. NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design of the centre.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December of 1988. During this phase, should an insurmountable obstacle be encountered by the planning and negotiating group, then the alternate site would be considered. The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year. In other words, for about 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties every two weeks by transport aircraft as they go about changing over personnel and resupplying equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1700. As these support personnel would be in Goose Bay on two or three-year postings, many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by 1000 or 1500 people, at least.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operation centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer products stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be operating of existing airfield facilities, such as a parallel runway, and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and

J-21

delivery system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season, or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out are concerned, I must emphasize that, to date, there exists only a hypothetical optimum model for this centre. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustment may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say that as currently envisaged, aircraft would partake in several training activities depending on their dedicated roles. These might be: low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance; air combat training, usually at medium to high altitudes including supersonic flights; electronic warfare training using on-board and ground based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery, and the optimum in the design here by the working group is for four practice target ranges; live weapons delivery, an optimum of three ranges; tactical air support of maritime operations or anti-shipping, this would require a sea range and I will talk more about that in a little while; and last, but certainly not least, flag-type exercises as we refer to them. These flag exercises involve multiple aircraft in a variety of roles in support of each other towards a common goal. Several of these requirements are desirable only. They are not essential for the scope of the centre. They are desirable due to the limited factors which might prevent these activities from being carried out at at a particular location. This includes a sea range which is merely an area for aircraft to practice tactics against shipping, and also, from time to time, to fire at targets towed by the ships. Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or unpopulated, it would quite conceivably have to be established over the ocean or not at all.

Since the initial statement of requirements for live weapons ranges in 1981, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. This is known as a no-drop bomb scoring system, and it has several advantages such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO training centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, however, very stringent criteria would govern selection of such a site. These ranges are typically are very closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could

D-23

accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full scope optimum facility was examined in this study, as it was defined in the Phase I Report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative, as any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would into two phases, the initial construction phase and the regular operational phase. Of possible interest to communities other than Goose Bay-Happy Valley and its immediate neighbours is the requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency or bad weather diversion. Goose Bay, being quite isolated, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the training scenario of the NATO training centre might conceivable require forward operating locations to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role. Both of these alternate field roles would require some upgrade of local facilities such as runway extension, refuelling capability, and possibly accommodations.

Potential locations being considered by the NATO working group are Schefferville, Wabush and

Churchill Falls. From the mention of these locations, incidentally, you may realize the working group has centered its suvey in 1985 of Goose Bay's potential on the nothern training area as it exists today. The southern training area would still likely see low level flying such as is currently carried on in Goose Bay.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals, particularly with reference to the NATO training centre, are based on optimum facilities. All nations today are undergoing economic cut-backs and belt-tightening exercises, and military programs are certainly not exempt. As actual planning and design details are worked out, and subsequent funding sources are identified for this project, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and the opportunity to address the interested public in Goose Bay-Happy Valley this evening.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, I will be more than willing to take any questions pertaining to my presentation or the NATO project at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Perhaps one or more of you would like to ask a question to Major McCabe? If so, again I would ask that you use the microphones standing

D-25

on the floor, and that you clearly identify yourself before you begin to speak.

Would anyone care to ask a question?

Yes, come forward please.

SUSAN FELSBERG: My name is Susan Felsberg of the community of Mud Lake. I am on your speaking schedule for tomorrow, but a question has just occurred to me of very general interest. Major McCabe mentioned that the decision of either Goose Bay or Conia, in NATO terms, will be made in part according to the environmental analysis in either country, or the environmental effect amongst many other items I am sure. I am generally interested, Dr. Barnes, as Canada is having a major environmental analysis, do you happen to know if Turkey has any similar process?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no idea. I have heard no such thing. How about you, Major. Have you heard any indication of that?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: To my knowledge, there is no study going on at this time. That does not suggest there will not be one. Turkey certainly has a different system that we have, and as Dr. Barnes mentioned, in fact even for ourselves this type of environmental process is quite new. I have not heard of any requirement to date.

SUSAN FELSBERG: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else have a question?

Mr. Stewart would like to ask a question.

MR. DON STEWART: I would like to address a question of clarification to Major McCabe.

On the question of ranges, which I know is a fairly hot issue, you used two figures: the figure of four, and then you followed that with a statement that if the optimum,full-blown was used there would be a requirement for up to three live ranges. I assume that those three would be part of the four you mentioned. Or is it four plus three?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: The latter assumption is correct, sir. There would be a total of seven under the initial definition or scoping of the 1983 completed report. As I mentioned, I think when it gets into the design phase, that number may well change. That is what they had based on requirements at the time.

MR. DON STEWART: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

PENOTÉ MICHEL: In the total of seven ranges that you are speaking of, would four be smoke, and not live bombing ranges, and the other three live bombing ranges? Would that be a correct assumption.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Yes, sir. That is correct. Again, that is as defined by the working group. Four of them would be, I would assume, almost identical to the range that exists in the southern training area at this time.

PENOTÉ MICHEL: Another question I would like to ask is: in the air-to-air gunnery range, which you referred to, you raised the question of it being only done in the ocean. Would the shells, the ordinances that would be used, in these flag exercises, anti-shipping exercises, be live weapons? Would they be real weapons, in other words?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Generally, as I mentioned earlier, this kind of training is conducted in various parts of Canada and the States and in other parts of the world. They normally use what we might call inert weapons, particularly the air-to-air firing. Usually that involves a target being towed by an aircraft. The hazards are obvious as it is. Using live weapons would just make a little worse. Generally, inert or practice weapons are used for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else like to ask a question about the project?

If not, I am going to call a 10-minute break now, during which time I would like anyone who wishes to speak to us tonight to go to Mr. Jim Clarke and register your name with him, and the name of any organization which you may represent. When we return we will see how many speakers we have for tonight, and we can decide how much time can be fairly allocated to each one. Thank you very much.

.D-1
ET:ET
Oct. 1

---Short Recess

---Upon Resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, may we start the meeting again.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have four persons who have indicated to us that they wish to speak tonight.

I would suggest 20 minutes as a maximum time for each presentation, unless there are exceptional circumstances.

First of all, and I am taking these in the order in which they were received, we understand that a representative of Environment Canada would like to speak.

---SUBMISSION BY BRUCE MOORES: My name is Bruce Moores. I am with the Conservation Protection Service of Environment Canada, stationed in St. John's, Newfoundland.

I really came here to give some more information on the project, and Major McCabe in fact provided that information.

We have reviewed the Guidelines that were produced, and I would like to pass along more suggestions that anything else, and not a formal position. We will be responding to the Panel in an Environment Canada response to the Guidelines, but in the interim, before that, I thought I would pass these along at the meeting.

Overall we had no difficulties with the Guidelines. We find them very comprehensive and,

Sub., Moores

in fact, with some close monitoring to ensure that the proponent, the Department of National Defence, follow the Guidelines as written, we would not foresee any problems, it being a very comprehensive review.

If I was to make -- I have two or three suggestions to clarify the Guidelines. The first one would be that the activities under the James Bay/Northern Quebec Agreement in the Guidelines -- that is incorporated, but under that Agreement there is a number of activities and what-not that are exempted from the review. I thought that it would, in fact, improve the Guidelines if they were stated or if they were outlined, what portions of the Agreement were included.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder, could you be a little bit more specific?

MR. BRUCE MOORES: The James Bay Agreement is fairly comprehensive and what-not in terms of what is being protected and the terms of the types of projects which may be extempted, which may not be included. In the Guidelines it just says that there are sections, portions of the James Bay Agreement which are included, which will be reviewed under these Guidelines. That is not outlined in the actual Draft Guidelines, so that should be either attached or whatever so everybody who is participating knows where they stand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wilkinson would like to comment on that.

Sub., Moores

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: I think that you are probably referring to Section 23 of the James Bay Agreement, which includes two schedules or annexes. One is a list of projects that are automatically subject to review and the second is a list of projects that are automatically excluded or exempted from review.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: Indeed.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Now, I think the feeling here is that this project as a project is entirely subject to review under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. There is, of course, a Memorandum of Understanding between the Kativik Regional Government and Environment Canada, which has combined the review under the federal laws, the EARP process and the review under Section 23. So, there is nothing in this that would be exempt under the terms of Section 23 of the James Bay Agreement, if I am understanding your comment correctly.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: Indeed, but that is the confusion we saw in the Guidelines and that was not exactly explained. If, in fact, that had been explained in the Guidelines as you have just explained them, that would have been clearer.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: I suspect, in that case, that perhaps a little more background information could be added which would satisfy your problem.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: Yes.

In the first paragraph of page 6 of the

Guidelines it is noted that the proponent is expected to follow the intent rather than the letter of these Guidelines. We are somewhat leery, in fact, whether that gives the proponent a lot of leeway. Again, it is probably a moot point, but some caution may be worth flagging there.

We were impressed with the point that it was stated up front that a go, no-go decision was not part of the review of at least Part I of this review. That, in fact, was a good approach in terms that the Panel and the people participating in the process would focus on the mitigations rather than trying to make a decision knowing that the Panel, in fact, will not be making that decision. We had hoped that any intervention that Environment Canada will have, will also focus on that aspect.

On page 9 of the Guidelines, they refer to the Beanlands and Duinker Report for ecological considerations in preparing environmental impact statements. We would just to flag the fact that that report has been released since 1983 and there has been a large number of environmental impact statements prepared since that time and very few of them have really followed these guidelines or this approach or this methodology and philosophy that Beanlands and Duinker put forward and that, generally, the people who are involved in environmental assessment agree that this is the way to go. So, we would like to flag the fact that, in fact, this is an opportunity to apply it again. We encourage the Panel to encourage the proponent and, in fact, will have to keep a fairly close watch over it to make sure that the proponent goes in that direction.

We had a question, I guess -- this may, in fact, be best directed towards Major McCabe in terms of fuel supplies. Major McCabe mentioned that, in fact, there would be some increase and maybe even a significant increase in the amount of fuel that would be brought in to support the low level flying and we were wondering whether the movement of that fuel, particularly to Lake Melville and up along the Labrador coast, is seen as a part of this review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you care to respond to that now, Major McCabe?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I would think that that -- I would assume that is part of the review. I might just qualify. I did not suggest that the fuel would necessarily -- there would be a large increase in fuel. The capacity, in fact, basically exists here right now of storage tanks, et cetera. I was referring more to things like the inactive ramp hydrant refuelling system, things like that. Yes, there would probably be an increase in tankers coming through as consumption increased but I would assume that that would have to be covered in that kind of thing because it is directly connected with the Centre.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: The Guidelines

Sub., Moores

actually refer to or focus more on this storage and handling of fuel. There is not any direct reference, in fact, to the movement of fuel through Lake Melville up the Labrador coast. It would seem obvious, as you indicated, that there would be a lot more tanker traffic because of the existing storage here, and we were just wondering if that would be a part of that review.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I would assume that that has not been included by virtue of the fact that the tankers do come in here anyway, regardless of what is happening. When I say an increase, I would think with the size of tankers today there would be some increase, not a significant amount.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: If, in fact, there are two tankers a year, or three tankers, and you increase that to four or five or six, that is a response to this project and, in the terms of reference, you would expect that that is a spin-off activity as a result of establishing this project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comment. I think what we will do is take note of your concern, inquire with the Department of National Defence and get some more specific information on possible increased level of transport of fuels up the coast. If we see the need for it, then we will modify the Guidelines accordingly to include that subject. Thank you.

MR. BRUCE MOORES: As a final point, I guess it really relates back again to Beanlands and Duinker in terms of identifying the value eco system components in terms of making this a very focussed review. We would, in fact, encourage that and that is in the Guidelines to say that those value eco system components, whatever they be, that is what the review will focus on, whether that be caribou or human health, that type of thing.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moores.

The next person who has indicated that he would like to speak is Mr. Kevin Quinlan. Would Mr. Quinlan come forward now to the table and make his presentation, please. Would you tell us all whom you represent, please?

---SUBMISSION BY KEVIN QUINLAN: I am the Principal here at the District Vocational School, which is to become the Labrador Community College by September of 1987.

In the Guidelines for the environmental impact review there are several references to employment opportunities that may result from the establishment of the NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre or from the continued use of the base as a NATO Training Centre. It is my opinion that the Draft Guidelines do not address strongly enough the types of employment and the depth of training that may be necessary as a result of a decision one way or the

Sub., Quinlan

other, on the Tactical Weapons Training Centre of the continued low level flying use.

The Community College will cross all peoples and all cultures in Labrador and, depending on which direction Labrador should go in its economic development, the decisions made by the powers that be will have a great impact on the future direction of the Labrador Community College. What I would like to see included in the Draft Guidelines are specific directives to the proponent to include projected types of employment, the type of training that may be required that can be offered locally, the expected duration of employment either in a construction stage or in a long term planning stage of the proposed project, and the numbers of people that can be expected to be employed not just here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay directly by the project but also on the coast of Labrador and also the kinds of indirect employment opportunities that may result from the proposed expansion.

If the Environmental Panel sees some problems with the proposed project, then I would like to strongly suggest to them that they would submit, in their view, as they have suggested on page 30, I think, Section 645. There are four subsections in 645 which address the topics of employment, subsistence and commercial hunting, trapping, fishing, employment from the socio-economic impacts of low level flying, and also the historic, existing and projected future resource use in terms of sport hunting and fishing and commercial hunting and fishing and subsistence activities as well.

So, I would like for the Panel, if they do see some problems with the proponent's projected expansion, that they would also suggest some alternate training projects or proposals that the Community College could look at in terms of employing alternate training programs at the Community College. To have the Draft Guidelines just sort of skip over employment as one word contained in four sections, I feel, and the Community College feels, that it would have a major impact on employment and training in Labrador. There will have to be considerable planning done at the provincial and local levels. It will involve, we would expect, an injection of federal funding and also, again, to what role the DND or the NATO group would play in either directly funding some programs at the College or be operating in co-operation with the Community College in offering programs and setting up curriculum guidelines for that.

So, those are basically the kinds of concerns that we have. I would hope that in the final Draft Guidelines those kinds of issues will be addressed and directed to the proponent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Would anyone care to ask a question of Mr. Quinlan? I hope you do not mind, Mr. Quinlan, if anyone would like to ask you a question. Major

McCabe?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Just one thing, sir, not so much a question as again a clarification to bring into perspective the timings here. Hopefully, as the current study progresses and the Environmental Impact Statement is produced by the proponent by next summer or late spring, if you recall in my brief I talked about the negotiations, the planning and design of the Centre. I have to re-emphasize that we have a proposal before us and it is an optimum-size thing. It is only during that two-year period in the future here that we will be able to find out exactly what is going to be built and required, et cetera. So, I think within the scope of the proponent's prepared statement, it might be difficult to provide the detail that you are referring to.

I would say that the study that is just about finished that DND is doing right now, does have -- it is a computer model that is used nationally in relation to project development, et cetera, and, indeed, with reference to this one, Cold Lake was used as a bit of an example for comparative purposes. I have seen some of the reports that have been produced in connection with this study and indeed they do get into types of jobs and indeed projected numbers. But, again, the limitation there is that they looked only at the scope as presented in the Phase I report. So, in a sense, it is best possible deal type of thing.

They came up with numbers that would

be national, provincial and local, split down percentage-wise, et cetera. Indeed, they were broken down by trade in a number of cases. So, I think that would be of some assistance there. To actually be able to identify what kind of training would be needed and, indeed, have an accurate number, I think, may be very difficult to do in the course of this preparation by the proponent.

MR. KEVIN QUINLAN: Our major intent on this is to bring home, both to the proponent and to the Review Panel, that the concerns of providing local people with employment opportunities as a first option is first and foremost in our concern, that we are provided with every opportunity possible to be a part of that training proposal and that the project does not go ahead in isolation of what the training and employment opportunities for Labrador may bring. If there are high-tech programs to be implemented, that we get an opportunity to implement those training programs here, rather than be told after it starts, "We have an immediate need and we have to go elsewhere to get it". So, we just want to be part of the planning process that goes on and we want to ensure that that is addressed by the Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Would anyone else in the audience like to ask a question of Mr. Quinlan?

If not, then I would like to give the Panel an opportunity to ask a question. I believe Dr.

Wilkinson would like to ask one.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Actually, it was not really a question, it was just to say that I agree with what you have said. I think that it is perhaps an oversight in the Guidelines. I think we have in mind, perhaps, much of what you were saying but I do not think we went quite far enough in expressing it, particularly in identifying the need for training. I do appreciate that that is something that has to be planned in advance and something that should be identified very clearly as requirements. I am glad you made the comments you did and I think we can amend the Guidelines accordingly, at least, personally, I would favour doing so.

MR. KEVIN QUINLAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any comment or question from any other Member of the Panel at this time? Very well. Thank you very much, Mr. Quinlan.

The next registered speaker is Mr. Peter Bradford. Would Mr. Bradford come forward, please?

---SUBMISSION BY PETER BRADFORD: I am here -- I do not represent any particular group, it is just a personal submission. Originally, I have intended to give you a letter but, if I may, I would like to read directly from that letter to you.

"Dear Sir:

I know that during your forthcoming meetings you will hear presentations

Sub., Bradford

from a varied group of people who are concerned with environmental effects on low level flying, particularly as they affect the people and wildlife along the low level routes. But I, sir, would like you to consider the effects of increased military flying activity upon the residents of Spruce Park residential area.

I am, in particular, pointing out to you the extreme noise, vibration and spent fuel exhaust problems that exist within this housing area during the jet fighter take-off phase and I am suggesting to you that, with increased jet fighter traffic, the noise, vibration and pollution within Spruce Park would become intolerable, even more so with increased night take-offs.

As an ex Royal Air Force pilot myself, I am fully aware of the air space confinements in Europe and a multitude of noise abatement procedures air crews must follow in those countries. Labrador is a vast area well suited to unlimited and deregulated flying training and it is not my intention to ask you to impose severe restrictions upon the movement of the jet fighters. All I ask

Sub., Bradford

is a little consideration to be given to the residents of Spruce Park.

I can offer two solutions: A jet fighter aircraft, when using runway 26, take off at the 8,000 feet level, thereby reducing substantially the noise, vibration and pollution levels currently experienced in Spruce Park. In my opinion, they certainly do not need, either from a safety point of view or an operational one, 11,000-odd feet of runway that is currently available.

I would like to point out to the Panel that air strips in Europe that cater to operational jet fighter traffic are rarely themselves of more than 8,000 feet in length. This restriction of using a shorter amount of runway would only apply to the jet fighters for the take-off. All other aircraft would be exempt and there would be no landing restrictions.

A second proposal would be to install some kind of noise vibration absorbent barrier between runway 26 and the Spruce Park area.

In my opinion, failure to consider the amount of noise, vibration and spent fuel pollution upon the residents of

Spruce Park in drafting up your Guidelines would be an injustice for us."

That is all I have to say, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would you remain where you are for a moment, please? Would anyone on the Panel care to make a comment or ask a question of Mr. Bradford?

Would anyone in the audience like to ask a question?

Thank you very much, Mr. Bradford. You were going to provide us with a copy of that letter, I hope?

MR. PETER BRADFORD: Yes, I can. I will get it typed for you and give it to you tomorrow.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You can mail it to our office, if you like, or pass it into Carolyn Maybee at our information office here in town. Thank you again.

MR. DAVID NUKE: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have something to say? We do have one more registered speaker.

MR. DAVID NUKE: No, just before somebody speaks, I would like to make a comment. For example, Mr. William Jourdain is not a fluently English person. He may speak English, but not fluently. I think at some point in time Mr. Jourdain will need a translator, a fluent translator.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comment. We have discussed with Mr. Jourdain in the past his participation on the Panel in terms of his ability with the English language. He has indicated to us generally that he is able to function satisfactorily.

Would you like to say something, Mr. Jourdain, on that subject?

MR. WILLIAM JOURDAIN: I would like to say that I understand enough English to listen to the meeting. As long as we do not have to take all the decisions on the same meeting, I think that I can study all the transcripts we are going to receive after that. That is why I said we could go without a translator. If some people at the meeting think that I need to understand very well what they said at the meeting, maybe I will be with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition to what Mr. Jourdain himself has said, one of the Members of the Panel and two of the Members of the Secretariat are fluent in both French and English. So, if there is any difficulty during the course of the meeting when we are not providing simultaneous interpretation, I am sure that one of those three people will be able to help Mr. Jourdain in overcoming any such difficulty. Thank you.

The last registered speaker for this evening is Ms Joy Pye-MacSwain. Would you come up to the front, please, and would you tell us the organization which you represent?

MS JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: I am with the Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace.

I am also with Mokami Status of Women.

I, basically, wanted to ask a question because I am not sure I am not maybe making a mistake here. Under the proposed NATO training base, in the section dealing with infrastructure, with respect to operating and maintenance requirements of the base.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you give us a page reference, please?

MS JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: Oh, I am sorry, page 22 and 23. The section I am specifically referring to is on page 23, "Liquid and solid waste treatment facilities".

Now, what I am wondering is is there a reason why liquid and solid waste treatment facilities are not considered under the section dealing with low level flight training under bilateral agreements? In 1974 the Royal Commission Recommendation 179 specifically mentioned that there should be treatment facilities for the Goose Airport itself. This is not including Happy Valley-Goose Bay. This has not been completed at this time, mainly because the Americans left, so we had a downslide. Now, we are on an upslide of personnel on the base. It would seem to me that this should also now be considered as a valid proposal. Is there a reason why it has not been included?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that your understanding is that the Guidelines do not mean liquid and solid waste treatment facilities of the base, because that is the intention.

MS JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: Under the NATO Agreement, but it does not appear to be included under the low level flying training component of the Guidelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MS JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: Is there a reason?

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: I cannot tell you whether our decision was right or wrong but I can tell you why we made the decision to limit it to the NATO base. That is because our understanding was that the low level military flights, as such, would not involve any additional construction, particularly residential occupation at the base, whereas if the NATO base went ahead, we foresaw that there would be additional construction, many more people living there. Therefore, we assumed that the existing facilities, about which, I admit, we know nothing, there was a possibility that the existing facilities would become inadequate and we wanted to make sure that attention was paid to it at that point.

MS. JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: I realize that there would be no additional construction made on the base but there would be an increase in various chemicals and things that the aircraft themselves use. For instance, I know Varsol is very often dumped in Lake Melville, which is causing -- I do not know the extent of the pollution but I am sure that there is some. There is a budding rock cod fishery happening at North West River. Pollution moves slowly, especially in water, but it will get there and may cause some damage down the road. If we are increasing the number of aircraft and personnel coming in, I would think we are also, therefore, increasing a lot of these chemicals, therefore increasing the possibility of additional pollution. Should we not, therefore, be considering liquid and solid waste disposal under low level as well as under NATO?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have recognized the points you have raised and we certainly will give a lot more thought to that in the course of refining the Guidelines into final form. We thank you for your question.

Do you have any other point to raise?

MS JOY PYE-MacSWAIN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else on the Panel like to comment on that or ask a question of the speaker?

Thank you very much for coming forward. We appreciate it.

That completes the list of people who indicated to us that they wished to speak to us this evening. I would like to now give one more opportunity for anyone who may have just thought, at the last moment, that he would like to come forward -- he or she would like to come forward and speak. Here is your chance. Yes, sir, come up to the microphone.

Would you give us your name, please?

MR. DAVID NUKE: My name is David Nuke. I represent the Innu people.

I would like to ask a question of William Jourdain. I am not trying to put William Jourdain in a bad position. I will speak to him in Innu and then I want him to translate it in English.

(Speaks in Innu).

MR. WILLIAM JOURDAIN: (Speaks Innu).

David Nuke asked me if I would like to have a, what we say, translator, if I have questions to ask of intervenors. Maybe I would like, if the -- like I said, they think that I do not understand in English. If they want, I would ask the Panel to have a translator.

MR. DAVID NUKE: Partly he is right but what I would like to elaborate on what I have told him.

I told him that at this time I do not see him wearing earphones where a translator would be translating for him. Maybe sometimes he wants to ask questions of people who are making presentations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. I should explain, perhaps, that we are providing interpretation in every community where it has been brought to our attention or where we have realized ourselves that there might be a need for such interpretation. For example, in the places where we have already been, where we were quite aware that most or all of the local population spoke a language other than English, which is the language of most of the Panel Members, we have assured that interpreters were present, we have provided French/English, English/French interpretation and there have been arrangements made for interpretation out of and into the Native languages, Montagnais and Naskapi.

In the case of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, there was no request made, no indication given to us that there would be a need for interpretation into or from French or to provide service to Native persons because it was not suggested to us that there would be Native participation at this location.

Again, you have heard directly from Mr. Jourdain that he feels confident that he can function in this situation. We can only take his word for that and continue what we have established as our practice. I do not know that I would like to say anything more on that at this point.

Would anyone else in the audience care to make a statement or ask a question, for example, about the whole review process or anything related to it in the mandate of the Panel?

If not, then I suppose the time has come to close this evening's session. I would like to thank you all for coming and, particularly, I would like to thank all of you who have come forward and spoken. We will be here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay for one more day. There will be three sessions of this meeting tomorrow. The first session begins at 9:30 in the morning and will go until 12 o'clock, the second session will go from 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. and the final session will go from 7:00 p.m. until -- we have down here, 8:30. That is not right. Could we have clarification? Until 10:30, 7:00 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. tomorrow night.

Thank you again and good night everybody.

---Whereupon the Hearing adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Volume

4

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	GOOSE BAY	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 2, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	4	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS. STONEHOUSE & CO LTD
TORONTO—OTTAWA—WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
B. WATTS	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Anglican Parish Hall, Grenfell Street,
Happy Valley-Goose Bay

DATE: October/octobre 2, 1986.

VOLUME: 4

OFFICIAL REPORTERS: Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.
PER: Eleanor Thomson

INDEX

PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman 311
Presentation by Major David McCabe 322

SUBMISSION/QUESTIONS BY:

Susan Feldsberg 335
Ben (Penote) Michel 387
Steve Michelin 422
Claris Rudkowski 427
Lieutenant-Colonel John David 438
Archdeacon Francis Buckle 443
Peter Bradford 464
Mayor Henry Shouse 472
Joy Pye-McSwain 487
Bob Bartell 488
John McGraw 499
Bart Jack 502
Tim Peacock 504

-oOo-

---Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before opening the meeting, I would like to draw your attention to the no smoking sign. I have been asked to point out to you that the prohibition on smoking applies to the corridor outside as well as to this room. For those of you who wish to smoke, I will be calling at least one break during the meeting this meeting so that you can go outdoors and indulge.

The other thing I have been asked to mention is that the washrooms are located downstairs, and the stairs are outside.

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Welcome to the second session of this meeting of the Panel here at Happy Valley-Goose Bay to discuss the proposed military flying operations in Labrador and Quebec. My name is David Barnes and, as you are probably aware, this Panel has been appointed by the Minister of Environment and the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of these proposed military flying activities.

I believe there are some people here this morning who were not here last night. Is that correct? If so, would you indicate by raising your hands. Thank you. In that case, I will present the information that I presented at the beginning of the session last night, for your benefit.

I would first like to introduce the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table on your left, down near the window, is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has had extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador. He is presently the Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resource questions. Prior to that, he was a research biologist with the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

To Mr. Northcott's left is Mr. Don Stewart, who is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position in the Forces was Deputy Commander of NORAD, which included responsibility for training, et cetera, with regard to U.S. and Canadian Air Defence Forces in NORAD. He presently lives in the Ottawa area and operates a small farm.

To his left is Mr. Tim McNeill, who lives in Makkovik, where he operates a small business. He is knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador and was, some time ago, involved in the provincial environmental review of the proposed Kitts Michelin Uranium Mine in Labrador.

On my left is Mrs. Beatrice Watts, who, I am sure, is well known to most of you. Mrs. Watts is Director of the Native Curriculum Centre of Labrador, which develops textbooks in Native languages. Having been, at one time, Mayor of North West River, she is also quite knowledgeable about municipal interests in this area. She was a Member of the

National Status of Women Council in 1983-84 and has also been involved with Labrador Legal Services, which provides court assistance for Native people.

On her left is Mr. William Jourdain, a Montagnais Indian from Sept-Iles, Quebec. Mr. Jourdain has been very active in Band affairs and has been Administrative Director of a shopping centre known as Les Galleries Montagnais in Sept-Iles. He worked for the Iron Ore Company for 20 years and is now retired.

On his left is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant established in Montreal. He has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, an agency of the Government of Canada located in Ottawa, where, for the past year or so, I have been Director for the Atlantic region. Prior to that I was employed with the Provincial Government of Newfoundland-Labrador in the Department of Environment.

The Panel is assisted in its work and its travels by a Secretariat on which we depend quite heavily for logistical arrangements and all that sort of thing. I would like to introduce to you the two Members of the Secretariat who are present this morning. Our Executive Secretary, Mr. Carol Martin, will be along a little later. Present in the room at the present time are Mr. Michel Bourgon, at the back, and Mr. Jim Clarke, sitting against the back wall.

I introduce these people to you because they are here in part to serve your needs. If you would like to know more about the review, about the Federal Environmental Assessment process, if you would like to request any of the publications available from the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, then by all means go ahead and speak to them and they will arrange to have whatever you need sent to you as quickly as possible.

The lady at the side of the front of the room on my left is Mrs. Thomson, who is taking care of recording the proceedings and whose firm will, in due course, produce official transcripts of all of these meetings. I mention that because those transcripts are or will be, I should say, public documents and will be available to anyone who wishes to have a copy on request to our office.

We have one speaker registered with us for this morning's session and a little later I am going to call a short break in the meeting, during which time I would ask anyone else who wishes to speak this morning, to go to Mr. Clarke at the back of the room and give him your name. At the end of that break we will then see who we have this morning who wishes to speak and we will be able to allocate this morning's time accordingly.

I believe it is important for us all to understand a little about this review and why it is going on, why the Panel is here ready to listen to anyone who wishes to speak to it. Very briefly, the reason why there is a review in progress is that in 1974 the Government of Canada decided that it wanted to increase the level of public consultation relative to the approval of projects for which the Government of Canada is somehow responsible.

In order to accomplish that, the Government established a process called the Environmental Assessment Review Process, which is commonly known as EARP. Within that process it is first the responsibility of the federal department or agency which is proposing a project to conduct what we call an initial assessment, which is a preliminary self-assessment phase conducted — largely internally by that responsible department which, for our purposes, is called the initiating department -- to determine whether or not there is a need for a public environmental review.

The key questions coming out of that preliminary assessment are two: First, is the project likely to cause significant effects on the environment; and, second, is the project likely to generate significant public concern? If either or both of those questions is answered by yes, then it is the responsibility of that initiating department to write to the Minister of Environment and request that he appoint a Panel, such as this one, to conduct a public environmental review. So, that is, in fact, what the Department of National Defence did.

What I would like to do is outline the present review for you in six steps. The beginning of the first step, in the case of this project, was in February of this year when the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment describing its proposal and asking that he appoint a panel to conduct a review.

In that document, which we call the Referral Document, the then Associate Minister of National Defence suggested what might be the scope of the review. From that, there were discussions between the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence concerning what should be the mandate of the panel. That led to the development of a document known as the terms of reference, which tells the panel what it is supposed to do. That was the end of the first step.

The beginning of the second step was the actual appointment of the Panel in July of 1986 by the Minister of Environment, at which time the Minister, in fact, gave to the Panel its terms of reference.

While all of this was going on and during the spring and summer of this year, staff of the Environmental Assessment Review Office held informal meetings, which we call scoping workshops, with a variety of interested parties to discuss the issues that were emerging in this review. Those parties brought into those meetings included agencies of the federal, provincial and municipal governments that were seen to have interest in the project, as well as representatives of various Native groups.

By the time the Panel held its first meeting, its first private meeting, there was a body of information put before it which had come out of these informal meetings. There had also been completed a review of the existing information in the literature. So, the Panel sat down, looked at all of this, drew its own conclusions and, as the end of the first step, published in August of this year a document which we call Draft Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

This document was put out in draft because the Panel is interested in having this document as complete and as good as possible because that guidelines document will serve as the instructions to the Department of National Defence when it begins to prepare its Environmental Impact Statement.

We are now in the midst of step number three, that is the preparation of the final form of this guidelines document. The Panel is holding a series of public meetings during September and October, the main purpose of which is to receive comments on this draft document so that we can see how good a job the Panel has done in preparing the draft and we can see where, perhaps, there might be some need to modify the draft to make it a better final document.

In addition to receiving comments of that sort, we have quickly found out that at the same time people are interested in saying other things to us, such as how they feel about the project, their experience with low-flying aircraft which form a part of the project. I suppose we might have expected this, given that it is the first time that the Panel has appeared before the public, and people would like to air their views.

When these meetings are over at the end of October, all of the information, the transcripts, any information that anybody might have given to us during the course of the meetings will be drawn together. During November the Panel will meet privately and consider all of this information and refine the document into final guidelines. We hope to be ready to present this guidelines document to the Department of National Defence in December of this year. That will end the third step of the review.

Step number four is the actual preparation of the document called the Environmental Impact Statement, which is certainly one of the key documents in this whole review. That document will be a statement by the Department of National Defence describing the project, in a fair degree of detail, predicting, from its point of view, what the environmenta impacts of the project are likely to be. If you have had an opportunity to look at the Draft Guidelines document, you will see that environment is being considered in the very broad sense, including not only the natural environment, the flora and fauna, et cetera, but also the social, cultural and economic environment of the people.

In addition to that, the document will also propose remedial measures which may need to be undertaken to offset harmful impacts of the project or measures which might serve to increase the beneficial impacts of the project.

In order to do all this, the Department of National Defence will review existing information, will conduct any new studies which may be necessary, and will write its report. We expect at this time that they may be ready to present this Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

Step number five of the review will be the examination of the Environmental Impact Statement and the holding of public hearings. The Environmental Impact Statement will be made public as soon as it is delivered to the Panel so that it will be available to the public, to the Panel and to the governments involved for examination and comment probably during the summer and early fall of 1987.

The Panel will then determine whether the Impact Statement meets the requirements of the Guidelines or if there are any deficiencies. If there are deficiences, the Panel is entitled to go back to

National Defence and request that additional information be presented. When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is indeed satisfactory, it will then announce plans for holding public hearings to discuss the project. The most likely time for those hearings would be the fall of 1987, and that will complete step five.

The sixth and final step of the review will be the preparation of a report by the Panel itself, in which we will look at all the information which has been presented to us through various channels. The report will discuss the project, its expected impacts, possible remedial measures and is certain to contain recommendations to the government regarding the project.

I would like to explain that the project or proposal consists of two main parts and it is important to understand the terms of reference of the Panel with regard to those two parts of the project. The first component is the low level flying activity which has been going on now for approximately six years involving training activity by several NATO member countries under agreement with the Government of Canada. It has been made clear in the referral document, which was given to the Minister last February, that it is intended that those flying activities shall continue, at least for the term of the Agreements which cover them, and, in fact, that activity may increase somewhat as other countries become interested in carrying on the same sort of activity.

So, with regard to that activity, the Panel has been asked to look at the activity and its environmental impacts and to recommend to the government whether there is a need for remedial measures to offset undesirable impacts or measures that might increase any beneficial impacts coming out of those activities. The point I am getting around to is that the Panel has not been asked to recommend that these current activities be continued or discontinued.

The other part of the proposal is the establishment here at Goose Bay of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. In that case, the mandate of the Panel is slightly different in that, in addition to being free to make recommendations on remedial measures related to possible environmental impacts, the Panel has also been asked to or been given the mandate, I should say, to recommend whether or not that training centre should be established at all.

So, all of those things together will form the content of the Panel report, which will be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence probably late in 1987 or early in 1988.

Now, the Panel is also very interested to see that the public has a good understanding of what the project actually is. It has become clear to us that there is a lot of information in circulation about the proposal, some of it is certainly factual information. On the other hand, we have heard certain things that strike us as perhaps not being entirely factual. So, for that reason, it will be our practice, as has been the practice with other Panels of this sort, whenever it is holding a public meeting, to invite to that meeting a representative of the proponent, that is the Department of National Defence.

We do, indeed, have such a representative with us today and I would like to introduce him to you now. Major David McCabe is sitting at the side of the room. Major McCabe has come prepared to give us a brief description of the project and he is also prepared to respond to questions from the Panel and the audience following that presentation, questions about the nature of the project.

I think this would be the appropriate time, Major, if you would like to come to the table at the front and outline the project for us.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen. For those of you who were here last night, I beg your indulgence while I give my presentation. I believe it is important that I do not shorten it too much for the benefit of those who have not had a chance to hear me last night.

Very briefly, concerning myself and my involvement in this project, my background includes a two-year tour at Goose Bay, my first tour in the military as an air traffic controller. For the past, nearly two years, I have been in Ottawa as a project officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre and have recently expanded that somewhat to include all plans and developments connected with Goose Bay.

I do not intend to occupy the public's time with detailed history of the military activity in the Goose Bay area, as I am sure you are probably well aware of it and, in fact, much more cognizant of it than I am.

I must say that Goose Bay has seen a constant military presence since 1941, albeit at various levels of activity. Since 1980 there has been a noticeable increase in military flying, especially low level flying, with the initial interest shown at that time for the German Air Force in commencing flying operations here. The Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to exmaine possible detrimental effects of increased low level flying activity, which also included consideration of the requirement for practice target ranges. This evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activities and has not or was not intended to be an in-depth on-site study by specialists.

The evaluation concluded at the time that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible but, as existing data on caribou was rather inconclusive and at times contradictory, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established with reference to caribou. In order to co-ordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Co-ordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises air crew on a daily basis of local restrictions in the area such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps.

The northern training area has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on maps for the air crew with a five nautical mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low-flying aircraft.

In a further effort to better handle allied military flying activity at Goose Bay, Canada this year has completed a two-year negotiation and signed a multinational Memorandum of Understanding with each of the allied users. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which existed between each allied user and several federal departments. Under the current agreement, Canadian Forces are the sole agent for the control and co-ordination of allied military flying activity at

Goose Bay.

The Agreement provides a definition of common use facilities which are equally cost-shared by all parties and dedicated use facilities such as barracks and hangars, which are funded entirely by the user. As well, each user is limited in number of aircraft and personnel which can be in Goose Bay at any one time. Any other nation wishing to train at Goose Bay must become party to this Memorandum of Understanding.

Currently, there are four signators to the Agreement. These being the Air Forces of Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level tactical flying activity. The Canadian Forces at Goose Bay support the long range radar and the approach control radar facilities and provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft. As well, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay.

The United States Air Force continues primarily to support transient transport aircraft. The Royal Air Force, although permitted up to 25 aircraft, currently maintain nine Tornado fighter bombers during the flying season, which typically runs from early March to end October.

The German Air Force is somewhat closer to its limit in the Agreement and it rotates between the Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets. Current operations consist primarily of tractical missions of between two to four aircraft flying at a variety of altitudes down as low as 100 feet above the ground in designated areas for usually one to one and a half hours per mission. The mission usually entails navigation training, tactical manoeuvering and, on occasion, delivery of inert weapons on a practice target range. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminant devices which sometimes contain a smoke charge to indicate impact point.

Currently, there is only one target range approved for use. It is situated in the southern training area, approximately 65 nautical miles from Goose Bay. It is a circle eight nautical miles in diameter and is located in an open sandy area previously burned out in a forest fire. The area is clearly marked with signs printed in English, French and two Native languages.

A second proposed target area is being examined in the northern training area but it has not received final approval at this time. Local interest groups are being consulted on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability to all concerned.

The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding. In conjunction with this proposed increase, some development of the southern practice target range is currently taking place. This includes development of a simulated airfield complex within that eight nautical mile area and it has supporting facilities, simulated facilities, such as surface-to-air missile sites and operation centres. These are all constucted of basic materials, such as logs and plywood, and are meant to be replaced as required. There is no intention at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Flying training by the current users will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying and may include some limited night and poor weather flying. These two activities are designed to trained air crews in the use of the terrain-following radar currently found in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by current users, other nations have recently shown some interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing training facilities in Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present the Dutch hope to commence a half season training program during the summer of 1987 flying F-16 fighters. Initially, 10 to 12 aircraft would be involved and about 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed between the governments at this time.

The other proposal which the Department

of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give a brief background to the NATO Training Centre project.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO Air Forces is conducted over densely populated countries of western Europe with a concentration over West Germany. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well-trained air force, NATO began studying the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked to submit their training requirements at the time and, based on these statistics, a NATO appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility to cater to all the training requirements.

As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in a Phase I report submitted to NATO in June 1983. Two countries have since offered potential sites for the Centre: Goose Bay in Canada and Conia Air Base in Turkey. Site surveys were conducted at these two sites last year by the working group and an initial recommendation has been submitted to NATO by the working group. NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design of the Centre.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December of 1988. During this phase, should an insurmountable obstacle be encountered, then the alternate site would be considered and the negotiations and planning would have to start all over again. The Training Centre is expected to commence operations in the early nineties, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting up to 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year or, in other words, for about 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties by transport aircraft every two weeks to support the changeover of personnel and resupply the equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1,300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multinational base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three year postings at Goose Bay, many of them could be expected to bring their families. Thus, further swelling the population by 1,000 or 1,500 people. Although this would represent a significant increase to the present population, it would represent only about half of the military and dependent population of the peak years of Goose Bay when nearly 12,000 people were posted here.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operation centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer product stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities, such as construction of a parellel runway and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season or expansion of the TransLabrador Highway.

As far as types of training activities which could conceivably be carried out at the Centre, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model for the project. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say that, as currently envisioned, aircraft would partake in several training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaisance, air combat training usually at medium to high altitudes which would include supersonic flight on occasion; electronic warfare training utilizing onboard and ground-based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery and, in the optimum design, this would be a total of four ranges required, similar to the one that exists in the southern training area; live weapons delivery, again the optimum being three ranges of a similar size, for a total of seven ranges; tactical air support of Maritime operations, which is anti-shipping, and that would require a sea range, which I will talk about in a second; and, last but certainly not least, what we call flag exercises. These exercises involve large numbers of aircraft of different types conducting a combined exercise towards a common goal. The sort of activity that would be expected to occur in actual hostilities.

Several of these requirements for the Centre, for the training roles, are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes a sea range, as I mentioned earlier, which is merely an area for aircraft to conduct tactical manoeuvers against shipping, against naval operations, and would include from time to time weapons delivery or firing at targets towed by the ships. Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be the air-to-air range, gunnery range. As this area usually requires a sterile or unpopulated area beneath it, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it was established at all.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges, technology has advanced to the stage that there is today a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. This system is known as a no-drop bomb scoring system and it has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex.

Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges, incidentally, are very closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could

accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full-scope optimum facility was examined in this study, as defined in the Phase I report that I referred to earlier.

The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative. As any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular operational phase. Of possible interest to communities other than the Goose Bay-Happy Valley and its immediate neighbors, is the requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency or bad weather diversion. Goose Bay, being quite isolated itself, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the training scenario of the NATO Training Centre might require forward operating locations to launch a small number of aircraft in adversary roles. Both of these alternate field roles would require some upgrading of local facilities such as runway extension, refuelling capabilities and some accommodations.

Potential locations being considered by

the NATO working group during its survey last year are Schefferville, Wabush and Churchill Falls. From the mention of these locations -- incidentally, you may realize that the working group has centered its survey, its area of interest, on Goose Bay's potential on the northern training area as it exists today. The southern area would still likely see low level flying such as is currently conducted.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals, particularly with reference to the NATO Training Centre are based on optimum facilities. All nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and the military programs are certainly not exempt from this. As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of the military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity of addressing the public here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay today and I would be happy to take any questions pertaining to the project or my presentation at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

Would anybody like to come forward and ask a question concerning the project? If so, I would ask you to use one of the two floor microphones in the room and to identify yourself clearly before you begin to speak.

Yes, Ma'am, please come forward.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: My name is Susan Felsberg and I represent Mud Lake community.

I have two questions, Mr. Chairman, for Major McCabe. Is there any anticipation in the near future for all year round winter low flying?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I have not heard of any desire or any intention to really go to a year round operation. I suspect, as the current users expand their numbers of aircraft and personnel, that they may extend the flying season somewhat but I have not heard of any specific intention to go year round.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: I am interested in this from the point of view of overall international defence. Since winter flying conditions in the north, in regards to terrain and so on, is very different from the summer. I realize it is a very expensive and difficult proposition to keep machines going in sub-zero weather and the operations and so on, but I am wondering if there is not some capability that has to be ultimately developed for flying in severe climate conditions of the winter?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Okay, I see now that you are really talking more about flying within Canada by Canadian Forces aircraft.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: And, no doubt, the NATO countries as well.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Yes, well, some of

the NATO squadrons, of course, do have what we call northern flank commitments where they fly in Norway and regions of northern Europe. So, indeed, the kind of training they can get here during the winter months is of benefit to them because that kind of weather that they might encounter in the northern parts of Europe certainly is not available in central Europe. So, it is beneficial to them that way.

With reference to the Canadian Forces, of course — andwe have, as you have mentioned, an increasing role and orientation to the the north of our country for sovereignty purposes -- we do train year round ourselves. A good portion of that is located in Cold Lake. So, our people certainly are trained in that, we have Arctic survival courses, et cetera.

I think, as the base here has developed, and the facilties on the base and in the range complex are developed, I would see the possibility of the allies, say, lengthening their season for those reasons.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: Thank you.

My second question, Mr. Chairman: I notice with some interest that both Major McCabe and Major Ongman, the information officer who was here a year ago, neither of them have made mention of the North Warning System and to what extent that involves the Goose Bay developments. I notice, particularly in the Draft Guidelines, apart from mention of a coastal range, there is also the phrase, "any coastal areas that may be overflown at low altitudes", on page 29. I am wondering if Major McCabe can comment on how far the North Warning System, supposedly a separate project and going ahead at considerable speed at the present time, is not in fact going to tie in, obviously, very closely with the Goose Bay development?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I can comment with only limited knowledge of that North Warning System, and that knowledge I have due to the fact that the desk officer for the North Warning System development and the forward operating locations, again, for the northern sovereignty happens to be working in the same shop as I do.

There is no connection between development of the military flying activity at Goose Bay and that North Warning System. However, for part of the North Warning System, as it is developed, particularly during the construction phase and, I guess, its on-going operational phase after, there are requirements for logistics supply sites and Goose Bay is designated as one of those. So, we could anticipate the establishment of possibly warehousing or storage facilities, something like that. Again, I do not know the requirement there. I would suggest that it would be a very modest increase.

As far as operations, you mentioned any low flying over the coast. Low flying is currently restricted over the coastal area for two reasons: One, the large concentration of birds. As some people may know, birds, despite their small size and feathered plumage do not get along with high speed aircraft at all, so there is quite a danger there. Plus, of course, there are lots of nesting areas, et cetera, which we would rather stay away from.

The other reason is that there are a number of communities along the coast. Because of the large area available in Labrador, we really do not need to fly there. So, any flying over the coastal areas at present is restricted to higher altitudes, if you like.

I mentioned the sea range area. Should that be established, obviously aircraft would have to transit back and forth from the range to Goose Bay. Because of the distance of the coast and fuel consumption, et cetera, I would suggest that, first of all, corridors would be established for that activity, obviously looking at unpopulated areas, and also, I would suggest, the altitudes would remain at the higher level.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: So, you do not anticipate low range patrolling tied in with the radar system?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: No, the radar system is strictly an air defence operation more oriented towards long range, et cetera. I do not see it being involved in our operations.

MS SUSAN FELSBERG: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are welcome.

Would anyone else like to come forward and ask a question about the project? No. Very well, then.

I am about to call a break in the meeting. Before I do, I would say again that, if anyone wishes to speak at this meeting, particularly if you wish to speak at this morning's session, would you please go to Mr. Jim Clarke, seated at the very back of the room, a Member of Secretariat, and indicate that to him giving him your name and the name of the organization that you represent, if that is the case. We will certainly make sure that you are given an opportunity to speak this morning, if that is your wish.

Just one more reminder that smoking is prohibited anywhere inside this building, that includes the corridor outside this room. So, if you wish to smoke, please go outdoors.

We will reconvene in 10 minutes. Thank you

---Short Recess

Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to resume the meeting, please. Would you return to your seats? --

Ladies and gentlemen I am reconvening the meeting. We have two persons who have indicated to us that they would like to speak to the meeting this morning, and we will invite those people to come forward in the order in which they identified themselves to us.

The first speaker, I understand, is to be Mrs. Susan Feldsberg, and if you are ready, Mrs. Feldsberg, would you come up to the table.

---SUBMISSION BY MRS. SUSAN FELDSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Susan Feldsberg. I am here in two capacities today. Firstly, to represent my community of Mud Lake, of which I am the Vice Chairman of the community committee, and also to speak on a personal level in connection with some of the items in the guidelines. I would like to thank you for changing my time of intervention. I realized yesterday evening that your introductions would have pushed me fairly tightly this afternoon, and I appreciate the change.

I would, perhaps, just like to mention briefly for the sake of the Panel a little of my own community, which is very small, is very old - one of the oldest communities in the whole of

Feldsberg, sub.

the Lake Melville area, and at one time was the largest settlement in the western end of the lake. It is now, of course, by far, the smallest. The community has fluctuated over the years. There was a major lumber industry there at the turn of the century, but basically it was a fishing and trapping community until 45 years ago when the airport was developed, and since that time Mud Lake has been an integral part of the economy of the upper Lake Melville area.

Breadwinners have jobs either in Happy Valley or Goose Bay, and they commute daily. We are a waterbound community, and therefore we are accustomed to travelling daily by boat, by skidoo, and partly by forestry road to get into this community. Also, of course, for our retail purchases.

I would particularly like to emphasize that small, though we are, we have a certain stability and independence, which, obviously, is locked into the overall economy, and in particular we are right on the edge of the flight path coming in from the southern flying zone and approaching the airport over the Lake Melville-Tarrington Basin route. I might comment here that I am a little surprised that we have this hearing without any maps to demonstrate what people may wish to indicate.

In a personal sense, I would just like to mention -- and this relates to some of the

Feldsberg, sub.

items I am going to bring up -- that I myself am a first generation Canadian, and I hope that after over 25 years residence in this area I can also be considered a first generation Labradorian. I have two children who, obviously, are second generation Labradorian, and our roots and our future are most definitely permanently in this area.

I have a number of items, Mr. **Chairman.** One or two of them will be repeats from last night but I feel it is appropriate to emphasize where something is of repeated concern. I would like, if I can, to begin with one or two simple items and move on to one or two more complex categories. But, first of all, I would, as someone who is interested in the process and has been familiar with some of its detail, like to compliment the Panel at this stage in the approach they have taken to what must be a particularly complex project in two particular regards as I see it as a member of the public.

One, that you are being asked to review both the present and a future project, and I realize that you have divided them and will consider them somewhat separately but the fact that you have an ongoing project and you have a future one must have been a very difficult accommodation to make.

Secondly, that you also are covering

Feldsberg, sub.

a number of jurisdictions; that you have agreed that this will be a federal and provincial combined process and that therefore you must relate to Newfoundland to the Quebec and to the north Quebec James Bay agreements.

I would like to start with some straightforward questions of definition in the text of the guidelines and I raise these as definitions for discussion; not necessarily to be clearly explained today. if that is not possible.

Page 31, this is a light hearted beginning, but I would very much like to know what is non-consumptive tourism. I would have thought myself that all tourists consumed something when they are in an area. On the other hand, I wondered if it meant non-tubercular! So, please, what is a non-consumptive tourist?

THE CHAIRMAN: I assure you it has nothing to do with tuberculosis, realizing that that is not in itself a humourous subject, of course. My understanding, and, of course, you are quite right in that everyone coming into any area consumes something if nothing other than food, I suppose.

My understanding of this term, and I would ask anybody else on the Panel who wishes to comment, would be tourism involving coming, looking and going away without taking away any of

Feldsberg, sub.

the wildlife or other resources of the area.

Now, would somebody else like to add to that?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I think I may, in fact, be responsible for the precise words, but, at least, in Quebec we use the term to make the distinction between sport hunting and sport fishing, and the other kinds of tourism activity: Canoeing, photo safaris, wildlife observation, and so on. It may not be the best term but that is what it is intended to convey.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Do you mean that those groups, the photographers and the sportsmen, they are non-consumptive?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Yes, they are the non-consumptive tourists.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Even if they have meals, overnight lodging, and buy a few postcards, they are non-consumptive?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: That is the term as we use it in Quebec to draw the distinction in the north between sport hunters and sport fishermen, who are the majority of the tourists. The others, we call them wilderness tourists, non-consumptive tourists and so on. I do not know whether the term is used in the same way in this part of the country.

DOCTOR NORTHCOTT: Yes, I might say that it is becoming more common to use the same

Feldsberg, sub.

term on the Island now for photographers.

MRS. FELDSBERG: So, by comparison, could I ask: Is a consumptive tourist then a family group where the children stay for a week in some location and consume everything in sight?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: No. For me, at least, a consumptive tourist would be a hunter or an angler. Someone who is there for other purposes regardless of how much they might eat, whether it is candy or coca cola or whatever else. We call them consumptive tourists.

But, certainly, if it is a term that is not understood here, I think we can find an alternative so that everybody reading it knows precisely what we mean. It is, perhaps, a local jargon for us that you do not share.

MRS. FELDSBERG: I think there will be some difficulty with that.

Another term I would like to comment on at page 20. Under the low level flight training program are a number of items listed for which information should be provided and in number eight:

> "Information on the frequency and distribution of sonic booms, ...".

I ask, what is the definition of a sonic boom, because, and, again, I speak from a very lay point of view, it seems to me a sonic boom is a boom created by breaking the sound barrier at 750 miles

Feldsberg, sub.

an hour approximately, and if all the low level flight training at the present time is sub-sonic there is no breaking of the sound barrier and there are no sonic booms.

However, the phrase "sonic booms" has already been used quite substantially in the literature and the rhetoric around this issue, so I am wondering if sonic boom is in fact a sound boom at a lower level of speed created by increased engine noise or whatever. I am not saying that this be clarified immediately but it should be very clear what is or is not meant by a sound boom.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart, would you care to say something to that?

MR. STEWART: To me it means breaking the sound barrier but if it is like the previous one then we could probably lengthen it and clarify it.

I think that is our intention, certainly in that paragraph, that we are talking supersonic flight should it happen. I would not want to be the one who amended the idea of sonic booms. To airmen I think that is generally accepted and it means supersonic flight.

MRS. FELDSBERG: And yet you have included it in the low level section of the study, which we are told is sub-sonic.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, would you like to say something on the subject?

Feldsberg, sub.

MAJOR McCABE: I think this possibly covers the area in the requirements for the NATO Weapons Training Centre. Again, under the phase one report, in their ideal scenario they are looking for air space where they can conduct low level super sonic flight.

At present you are correct, Mrs. Feldsberg, that we really do not do that, and, in fact, in most training it does not occur. There are situations where, again, it is sort in a defence/attack scenario where an aircraft might be transitting from a higher level down to attack an aircraft in the low level regime there where he might, indeed, succeed the sound barrier. That is why, because it is one of the things that was put in the definition of a NATO centre, they wanted to cover that; whether it will actually occur on a regular basis or not really has to be decided in the study.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could clarify this. Are you saying that sonic booms are very unlikely to occur or will not occur at all in the course of the present sort of low level flight training activity?

MAJOR McCABE: That is correct, sir. I think on occasion -- I can refer to the flag exercises; the majority of sonic booms indeed occur in the air-to-air type of training, which is

Feldsberg, sub.

at the higher level. The capability of fighter aircraft nowadays some of them certainly can exceed the sound barrier in the low level environment but it is a rare thing because one of the main things is the excessive fuel consumption required to get up and maintain those speeds.

What we want to do, obviously enough, is should that occur occasionally in training we want to make sure that that is included in the study. It is not something that occurs on a regular basis by any means.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess that subject to, perhaps, further discussion with Department of National Defence that this same sort of paragraph should appear in the section dealing with the training centre and whether it stays where it is in the section dealing with current low level flying operations would depend on those discussions. It may or may not, so thank you for bringing it up.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, I had not really noticed that it was in the separate one. Normal low level flying, indeed, is definitely sub-sonic. I suppose, again, I should emphasize, it would only occur in sort of an evasive manoeuvre; certainly not on a regular basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor Wilkinson would like to say something further.

Feldsberg, sub.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: By putting the reference in at this section we were not trying to imply that there would be sonic booms. We realize that the low level flights at the present time are sub-sonic, and we asked for information, first of all, on the frequency of sonic booms. Now, if the answer to that question is that there will be none as far as the low level flights are concerned, then the issue would be dropped. But, I think we put it in in the spirit of caution. It obviously is an important phenomenon. It is not part of contemporary low level flights, but just on the off chance that with different kinds of aircraft there can be aircraft that are projected to be used and so on. In case it might happen, we wanted to make sure that it was adequately treated as part of the low level flights.

THE CHAIMRAN: I see that somebody in the audience has indicated he would like to have something to say at this point. I think the procedure we should follow is that we should keep all comments and questions from the audience until the speaker at the table has finished her presentation. There may continue to be some responses from the Panel in response to questions from the speaker, but I think the audience should wait until the presentation is finished before making comments or questions, if that will be all right.

Feldsberg, sub.

Would you continue, please, Mrs. Feldsberg?

MRS. FELDSBERG: Therefore, if we are to decide on the technical definition of sonic boom for this purpose, it should be made clear to the public and to the audience, in general, that any comments regarding sonic booms at the low level program do not pertain. Thank you.

Page 27, paragraph four, talking of a description of an existing environment:

> "The intent of this section is to provide the context or baseline description of the environment, against which the impacts of the Project can be identified and evaluated."

Since, we are reviewing a program which has been already ongoing for six years, at least; if not longer, I am wondering if the word "baseline" is appropriate; that, surely, much baseline data has already gone out of the window long ago, and I suggest that, perhaps, some alternative wording should be used there.

I think "baseline" is misleading and I suggest that it will raise questions for future readers, scientists, who go into this material and are puzzled as to how one finds a baseline after six years of active program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would somebody on the Panel care to respond? Doctor Wilkinson.

Feldsberg, sub.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I think the point you make is a good one. All I can say is that is how I would approach this if I were not a member of the Panel but, perhaps, one of the consultants trying to do the study in question.

I think one approach that one might take is that the whole of Quebec/Labrador has not been overflown. There are areas where low level military flights have not occurred. I think one could, perhaps, look at those as a source of baseline data; obviously, it would take a lot of judicious comparison between the northern and the southern zones to make sure that they are in all important respects as similar. I think, also, that there is a large body of data on many subjects that has been collected about the regions prior to the time that the low level military flights began, and, if necessary, I think one could use this data.

Having said that, I agree with you that it is a less than perfect situation. One would like to have information about the precise areas in question before any kind of activity had taken place, but I do not think that it constitutes an insuperable obstacle to doing a fairly good study. I think one can come up with: What can reasonably be considered as adequate baseline data.

MRS. FELDBERG: Thank you.

Feldsberg, sub.

On the same page, in the second paragraph, I raise an issue which is a difficult one in this region to address, but it is something I think the Panel must come to terms with very quickly. The text reads:

> "The description of the environment must include a survey of the aspirations of the native and non-native residents."

I raise this question not because I want to draw any racial or ethnic lines around anybody, but, this general phrasing has already caused considerable difficulties in the Canadian Public Health Associations review as far as they have got with their health review. Their interim report used these terms to some confusion. It became apparent that they themselves were not entirely sure what they were talking about. I think they changed their context from page to page, if I remember rightly, and I did discuss it with those eminent physicians.

Therefore, I raise the question again with this Panel, that you, for your own purposes and for the researchers and for the public, must clarify this phraseology at an early stage.

Do you mean native in the narrow aborginal precise sense, or, do you mean native in the much broader native-born sense, of which, I

Feldsberg, sub.

think many, many Labradorians would associate themselves with in the native sense.

I notice that in the terms of reference for the north Quebec/James Bay details the word "native" is spelled with a capital N, and I think that implies there is a very precise definition there and it refers to the aboriginal people. This is not the case in this text. We have the small n, and, as I said, Mr. Chairman, I do not expect clarification today but it is something that has to be very clearly defined.

What does EARP mean, and what do you expect the researchers to mean when they get into this terminology?

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the definition of the term "native" needs to be very clear not only in our guidelines document but also in the Environmental Impact Statement that will eventually be written by the Department of National Defence.

I wonder whether it will be possible to provide a definition that will be satisfactory to all parties resident in the area. That is the first thing we better try and find out. If it is not going to be possible to come up with a definition satisfactory to all parties, then, perhaps, we will have to avoid the use of the term all together. I would prefer not to go that route. I would just

Feldsberg, sub.

hope that we could come up with something that would make clear that there are different peoples here in this area and they have different aspirations.

We take your suggestion and your advice under advisement and we will look very carefully at that.

MRS. FELSBERG: I do mention this, Mr. Chairman, not only for the political reasons that lie behind it, obviously, but also for the pure confusion that it can create.

On page 13, there is an indication that the issues include item (6):

> "the cumulative effects of the Project and of other projects and activities in the region;",

and I just raise the question, since this is a huge project which DND has to address in great detail, I am quite sure, to what extent can DND be expected to analyse other projects?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the extent to which they will be able to analyse them and their effects will depend on the degree to which the Department of National Defence itself is responsible for those other projects and activities. Obviously, they will do a better job with projects that are of their doing compared with projects initiated by other proponents.

The point of this item, of course,

Feldsberg, sub.

is that too many environmental impact assessments have been done in the past with a very narrow viewpoint; considering only the Project that is the central focus at the moment, and has not taken into consideration how the Project in question will add to impacts already begun by other projects.

This is the whole point of having this item in here. As we say at the beginning of the guidelines, we expect the proponent to follow, as far as possible, the intent of the document, and we realize that there may be instances of other activities going on in the region for which National Defence is not responsible and they may be able to say very little. It will be a spectrum, I think, of success, if you want to put it that way, which they will deal with these things.

Would anybody else on the Panel care to say something on that?

MR. STEWART: Only I think these issues were identified and we did not do it. They flowed from discussions and the scoping exercises and so on, but I think it was mainly intended that DND not proceed merrily along with their Project, if something else was going on up the river, for example, and the impacts that would occur, should they be coincident. It could be chaos. I think that was really the intent. So, I would not expect great detail on projects that are outside the responsiblity or control of DND.

MRS. FELDBERG: Thank you.

There is considerable mention throughout the text of a proposed sea range, and I know that Major McCabe has described that as far as he is able. It has been interesting to hear in the media when this question was first a cause of interview and so on with senior DND people, that at that point, and even in Ottawa, there was very little detail known as to what a proposed sea range would amount to.

Perhaps, I am being a little facetious here, but I presume that that detailed requirement of the sea range will be known in the DND process in the course of this review; otherwise, it cannot be studied very easily.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you say, of course, is true, that there is very little information on that subject in the original referral document.

The Panel identified this lack of information and has written to National Defence asking for a lot of additional information on this and other subjects. Major McCabe has already provided us with more information than was available in the referral document, and I can only presume that more and more information on that subject will be forthcoming.

My understanding is, that sea ranges are a desirable but not necessarily an essential

Feldsberg, sub.

part of the operations of a NATO training centre.

Would you like to elaborate on that, Major McCabe?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, sir. You are correct there. As I did mention, I wanted to stress that fact of desirability only for obvious reasons. Again, I refer back to the initial scoping of this thing where they had no potential sites in mind or offered. They had to overlook at the overall training requirement. If they established, for example, the red flag exercises that are held in the Nellis Airforce Base in the middle of the Nevada Desert they are not able to do any of this anti-shipping training. So, it is a case if it is available it would be nice to have.

I must, again, make reference to the fact that these kind of ranges already exist and have existed for some time off the coasts of North America and we have them in areas in Europe. So, indeed, when DND provides information during the study on this, it is not that it is something new. It is probably something new as far as the public is concerned, because it is not something that you hear about very often, but if you look at aeronautical charts, for example, there are areas both over land and over water which have a designation and defined limits, if you like, boundaries on them, and they are used for those purposes.

Feldsberg, sub.

So, it is not that it is something new that has never existed before, and certainly details of what would be required and what kind of activity would be expected to go on in those ranges would certainly be available.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. Would you like to continue?

MRS. FELDSBERG: I find it significant, Mr. Chairman, that apparently there are any number of variables coming up to be considered by your Panel and that must surely create major difficulties. I have visualized processes in the past to be very precisely defined, and you are, obviously, going to have to come to grips with any number of variables as they develop after December.

THE CHAIRMAN: It certainly appears that we are dealing with a conceptual project, a project at the conceptual stage of planning with regard to the NATO Training Centre, and, yes, it is going to be difficult for the public to get a grasp on that and it is difficult for us to define all of the issues in the face of this conceptual thing that we are looking at.

I hope that others in the public, in addition to yourself, will understand our dilemma in this and will bear with us while we try to extract more and more information to come up with a better defined Project to deal with.

Feldsberg, sub.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Thank you. I will move to something a little bit more definite now, which was mentioned last night and which I would like to re-emphasize in a slightly different context.

On page eight, it is stated:

> "the continuation of the review of the TFWTC will depend on a decision by NATO, expected in late 1986, whether Goose Bay is a candidate for the TFWTC."

I presume from that, that if the training centre invitation does not come to Canada in late 1986, the whole of the training centre section of these guidelines will be scraped.

THE CHAIRMAN: That appears to us to be a reasonable assumption. However, I would like to emphasize that that is just an assumption and that we, as a Panel, will continue to pursue our present course on the whole mandate that we have until we are directed otherwise by the Minister.

Major McCabe, you would like to say something?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, that is an excellent question. In fact, there was an announcement made recently during the visit of the Minister of National Defence to this area with reference to that recommendation.

I wanted to use this opportunity in

Feldsberg, sub.

all of our public hearings during my presentation to clear up an area of confusion and understanding over this process that the NATO people go through.

The decision made in December is merely for the selection of the most suitable site. During that two-year planning and negotiation phase, and it is very important to understand this, whatever recommendation is made in December, should it, for example, select the Turkish site, then planning and negotiations commence with the Turkish authorities. If a year from now they reach a stage where they feel it is not possible to progress with the negotiations or the planning to achieve the desired goal, then one of the recommendations that has been endorsed by the group in Europe already is that the alternate site be kept open through the whole course of negotiations.

Until such time as they start pouring concrete and hammering nails in the construction of this site, the other alternative must be kept open. We would be, I think, foolish, upon hearing that the decision had gone to Turkey, for example, to cancel that because we would be in a very bad position a year from now if they turned around to Canada and said, we would like to consider you people.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Thank you.

That leads on then to the item raised last night. In the training centre section on

Feldsberg, sub.

page 23, this is a matter which concerns my community very, very much, and was raised with the DND information team when they were travelling Labrador a year ago, and that is the liquid and solid waste treatment facilities.

I was interested last night when Ms. Pye-McSwain raised this question. She brought in the matter of chemicals and pollutants that might be disposed in the future. I and my community are more concerned with the present state of affairs, and as they relate to any immediate increase in the population and activity; never mind a training centre.

I was interested last night when Doctor Wilkinson stated that he did not know the present details. I would be delighted to enlighten you. In 1981, the total sewage system of this area was redesigned at a cost of $2 million by the Department of Public Works. The design and contracting and so on was also, of course, handled through the provincial department and the local municipal government.

As a result of that total redesign, the two separate systems: One in Goose Bay flowing north and the one in Happy Valley flowing south, were brought together, and the total sewage outfall, raw, untreated, 1.6 million gallons daily at the time of the project in 1981; I do not suppose it has

Feldsberg, sub.

changed very much, flows south into the Churchill River upstream from the Happy Valley population. This has been going on for five years.

A number of citizens were deeply concerned at the time and protested and lobbied and achieved no change in the design. We were assured that, if there was to be any further increase in the population or economic activity, there is land available within the system to incorporate a treatment plant, if and when that were needed.

I have to insist that my community, in particular, is concerned about this not only because we are eight or 10 miles downstream but also because we are river people and we know that river. The outfall does not go into the main channel; it goes into a side channel. There are substantial sand bar build-ups, which change from year-to-year according to ice and erosion and water flow and so on. The seasonal water flow changes very considerably, partly in connection with Churchill Falls hydro controls and partly, of course, with the weather conditions. We also have very strong tidal influence from the northeast, particularly when we have northeasterly winds coming in from Lake Melville, and the influence being felt well upstream, which, presumably, changes the effluent flow.

In the last five years, my community

Feldsberg, sub.

has noticed and I think this is a small indication of the problem, that eight miles downstream from the main community our boats during the summer are now no longer stained green with algae, et cetera; they are stained brown, and they cannot be easily cleaned. I have witnesses in Mud Lake to that effect, and I suggest strongly that that solid waste treatment item should be in the present Project analysis; not the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for providing us with that information. Several members of the Panel may have been aware of that already. We will certainly take it into account and decide whether we need to modify this and possibly other sections of the guidelines to make sure that the Panel is provided in the Environmental Impact Statement with a better picture of the current situation. Thank you.

MRS. FELDSBERG: The immediate next paragraph to that:

> "storage for fuel, munitions and
> other supplies ...",

I would like to emphasize what Mr. Moores said last night. I am very surprised that there is no mention there of fuel movements.

When the American Air Force had major fuel supplies coming in here regularly right into the inner basin, I believe, and I stand

Feldsberg, sub.

to be corrected on this, but I believe there was regular annual dredging of that channel, and I do not think that has occurred on a regular basis since 1976 when the Americans left.

If we are going to have increased tanker traffic, and I can only speak for the upper end of the Bay, goodness knows what the hazards are around Rigolet and the narrows and elsewhere, of course. But, I do strongly suggest that movement of fuel has also to be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think Doctor Wilkinson would like to say something in response.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I have been thinking about that since Mr. Moores mentioned it last night and I agree with you it is not specifically mentioned. I think, again, this was perhaps we were at an early stage of this Project and we, perhaps, did not have the knowledge to be aware of that.

Even were it not mentioned specifically in the guidelines, I would hope that the Proponent would have done it. We do say, for example, that the proponent has to identify and describe all associated projects and activities, and that will be required as a result of the initiation or continuation of either component of the Project.

So, as far as I am concerned, the proponent should be aware of it and should do it

Feldsberg, sub.

even if we do not think of it. This, again, gets back to another comment that Mr. Moores made last night and I think the point he made was correct, that he made a reference to our statement that the proponent is expected to fulfill not only the latter of the guidelines but the spirit. I agree with him, and I spoke with him privately earlier today that, perhaps, it is badly drafted but we did want it to be clear in saying that, that just because we, as a Panel, might forget some particular element that does not absolve the proponent who should know perhaps even better than we do certain things. It does not absolve him from the responsibility of treating them.

I think where we can find out these details is as a result of interventions such as yours, and then it is encumbent upon us to deal with them very specifically in the guidelines and I am grateful to Mr. Moores and yourself for raising this.

MRS. FELDSBERG: I am wondering about a possible omission on page 31, Mr. Chairman. "Socio-Economic and Resource Use Data", item (vi):

> "commercial aviation, including the use of air space in question by international and domestic flights;".

I am wondering if there should not be some assessment made of the potential or the restriction of potential

Feldsberg, sub.

on commercial aviation expansion. Also, as related to land-use, commercial land-use in a local area, and alternative commercial developments.

Concern has been expressed over many months, that if we have an increased military presence here there might well be some restriction of commercial aviation when, in fact, this airport has great potential, if ever we can get politics out of the way. This area should have had a duty-free zone and commercial freight importing/exporting groups, something like the TOPS program in Gander, et cetera, et cetera. This airport should have had these things long ago, and the potential is still there but if this military presence increases substantially we have takeover facilities. We have increased use of the airspace.

Should there not be some examination in anticipation of how far that commercial potential is going to be restricted, if at all; maybe it is not going to be.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Major McCabe has something to say on that point.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, sir. As I mentioned earlier, I am involved with other aspects of Goose Bay apart from the NATO centre, et cetera.

I believe you did make mention of your concerns in that. We are in the process of negotiating and planning a transfer of control and

Feldsberg, sub.

main responsibility of the airfield from Transport Canada to the Department of National Defence.

Again, it ties in with the expanded development that we perceive will hopefully come here. We recognize that a build-up of activity here by the military will, I think, necessarily because of the remoteness of the location and the dependency on civilian aviation. I am quite sure, and, in fact, I know we recognize the fact that an increase in military activity will definitely bring an increase in civilian aviation both airliner type and possibly even local operators having more customers from the increased population that would be brought in.

Part of the development that is taking place as far as planning by the Department of National Defence and with other departments is oriented towards -- you mentioned takeover facilities. We, in our current planning, perceive a development of what we know as the south side, which is really the active area right now. We see that developing into the military area so that we keep the military all contained, and we perceive an expansion or redevelopment of the north side into a civilian aviation area, be it an industrial park or whatever, in recognizing the obvious expansion requirements that I think will come. We already see an indication of that today of the civilian

Feldsberg, sub.

operations. That would be best for all parties concerned is to have an unrestricted area over there for development rather than having it being bound in by military expansion on the south side.

So, it certainly is not the intention of the military to restrict any kind of expansion. Obviously, what we do have to do is co-ordinate it all for the safety of everybody, and airspace, in fact, is also part of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. I think then what we should do is amend the guidelines to make sure that information on potential expansion of commercial aviation here would be included along with the description of the current situation. Would that be satisfactory?

Then, following from that in the impact prediction section, the Department of National Defence would be required to talk about impacts not only on the present situation but on potential expansion. Would that be what you are asking for?

MRS. FELDSBERG: And, how far they foresee any restriction, a limit on commercial activities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, thank you.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Mr. Chairman, that brings me to my last item, which is one I know has already created some discussion and I would like to

Feldsberg, sub.

elaborate on it a little further and that is the question of the inclusion or exclusion of Labrador communities in this process.

I referred earlier to the visit of the DND information team a year ago, which came and visited all Labrador communities to inform everyone in this region as to what Goose Bay potential was and what was developing here. In the introductory remarks to that presentation, the Chairman made the following statement and I would like to read it to you. This is a paraphrasing and I imagine since he is present here today that he can correct anything that is inaccurate here, but I read as follows -- the Chairman stated a year ago:

> "We are visiting all Labrador communities at this time because if the projected military developments go ahead as proposed what will happen in Goose Bay will affect Labrador in the same manner that Hibernia is going to affect the Island. This project will cause social dislocation; hence, the message is being carried to all. There will definitely be further opportunities for dialogue and repeated visits by the officials here this evening for some time to come."

Feldsberg, sub.

I think that last point about visits by officials there is some hint of the environmental assessment process that was to develop; not necessarily DND officials alone but officials in the overall bureaucratic sense of the word.

We have, therefore, a very interesting situation where a year ago a DND information team made the effort to go to every single Labrador community. We now have an environmental assessment exercise analysing those developments, which is not making a similar commitment in the direct physical visit sense. I fully understand that you cannot, in a very complicated process and a large team of people, visit every single small spot on the globe, but, we refer back to the fact that this Project will affect the whole of Labrador.

My own community is very, very small but it is totally integrated within the Goose Bay economic scene. It is on the edge of the flight path, yet we are not being visited.

I suggest that the whole EARP exercise is an education process but it is a two-way street. The public is being educated about environmental assessment, but the communities are also more than willing and available to educate the EARP team about their own lives and communities, hopes and problems. I suggest that this business of community coverage

Feldsberg, sub.

has got to be studied a little bit more closely in a number of regards.

First of all, I think what the EARP team themselves is prepared to cover in terms of visits - where and where it is not appropriate, and secondly, and very importantly, where you indicate that the researchers must visit. I mention here that in the item in the guidelines on page 30, Socio-Economic and Resource Use Data, you mention:

> "(i) the distribution and characteristics of the human populations, including such aspects as population trends and composition, traditional lifestyles, communities, employment, Health, public facilities, and housing;".

I strongly suggest that the EARP team has to identify those comunities one-by-one-by-one, which must be included in the studies.

If I could just digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to Mud Lake's experience with a previous environmental assessment, a provincial one which I am sure you are familiar with, the one concerning the Trans-Labrador Highway. When our community received the terms of reference for that assessment signed by the Provincial Minister of the Environment, in the preamble that term of reference mentioned communities adjacent to the

Feldsberg, sub.

proposed road. In the study objective it mentioned those communities within the local region of the Project area, and in only one place in the text did it state as follows:

> "The study area will include ..."

and this was for the Trans-Labrador Highway Tote Road,

> "... the towns of Wabush, Labrador City, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Churchill Falls, Northwest River, Sheshathui, and Love Stick.",

and we were omitted.

We appealed to the Department of Environment, provincial, and they were good enough to adjust the terms of reference even after they had been signed by the Minister. During that discussion and adjustment we had some very patronizing comments made to us, such as: "Oh, well, you are included in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay section of the analysis", or, "We presume that you will be included", and we responded by saying, "Nothing must be presumed". One researcher will come along and recognize us on the map and include us. The next researcher will come along and will not recognize us. In addition to which, we are 10 miles away from the Municipality of Happy Valley. We are not a part of it, and we are a separate community with our own integrity, and we need to be

Feldsberg, sub.

included and what happened in that exercise can possibly happen again with this one not only for ourselves but for other communities likewise.

Are you expecting researchers to include Makkovik or Port Hope Simpson, or, are you leaving it to them to decide and then you are going to come back afterwards and say, this is not sufficient? I suggest that the Panel has to make some choices.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this is going to require a long answer.

I can certainly see some logic in what you say. At the same time for the Panel to try to provide a list of communities to be studied by the proponent is a little bit of a risky business, in that it indicates that the Panel is pre-supposing where the impacts are likely to occur, and at this stage of the game we do not want to pre-suppose anything.

We are certainly willing to provide guidance to the proponent in identifying geographical areas to be studied and communities to be studied, but to lay down a list might be a little premature at this point. We have followed, I think, the pattern established by previous panels of this sort in attempting to identify locations for public meetings. We have, as I indicated earlier, held preliminary meetings with various interested parties,

Feldsberg, sub.

and in the course of those meetings have received advice on certain communities where we should hold the public meetings.

We talked about this at great length. We sat down and we looked at the map and we saw that there are certainly a great many communities in Labrador and in the Province of Quebec, and we considered the practicality of attempting to visit each and every one of those communities and decided that such would not be very practical given the timeframe in which we had to work; given the size of the group that we have to transport around, and the size and weight of equipment that we have to carry with us to certain locations.

Based on all of that,we came up with the list that we have published. In addition to the communities that we are actually visiting, there are several others where we have made arrangements to bring in a limited number of local representatives at our expense, to bring them into nearby communities that we are visiting. Even during the course of this week's round of meetings, we became aware of some feeling that we should have included the Strait's area of Labrador in our itinerary, and responding to that we have, in fact, arranged to visit L'Anse au Clair on Saturday night of this week following our meeting in the day at Mary's Harbour.

Feldsberg, sub.

With regard to your reference to the Hibernia review, you said yourself that offshore petroleum development could well affect, in some measure, nearly every community in the Province, and certainly the Hibernia Panel did not attempt and I think could not attempt to visit all of the communities on the Island of Newfoundland let alone all of them in Newfoundland and Labrador.

In addition to what we have already planned -- I would make the offer that, as we have done -- if anyone in any of those other communities would like to attend a meeting that we have planned we would make the same offer to cover travel and associated expenses for a limited number of representatives from each community. We certainly did look, particularly, at the possibility of visiting Mud Lake. We looked at the logistics involved in travel to Mud Lake from here and certainly it seems that travel at night is not very practical, so that it would have been necessary for us to plan a session in the morning or afternoon, at which time a great number of residents of the community would not be present. There were also some problems associated with the landing of equipment. So, for that and other various reasons we did decide instead to offer transportation costs to persons like yourself who wish to come over and attend a session here instead.

Feldsberg, sub.

That is all by way of explanation. I do not think that I should apologize for the Panel's choice of meeting locations and I think we made it in good judgment and in good faith. I do not know if anyone else on the Panel would like to add to what I said. I think that is all I would want to say in response to your statement at the present time.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand the difficulties particularly of moving a large team to Mud Lake and I am sure the community does also. Perhaps, we are a little bit sensitive about this because we are regularly omitted from other exercises and we constantly to have to sort of stand up to be counted.

Might I just say, in summary, and this also raises a question with regard to the actual research study part of this process, which, again, we have met with the previous provincial assessment that I referred to, and that is, when we were included in certain demographic analysis and so on. The information was solicited by telephone and a couple others on the local committee had to donate our precious time, which we did in the interest of the community, but nevertheless a great deal of the onus of gathering the material was placed on us, the community leaders, and our time, and was conveyed either by letter or by telephone. I suggest we have

Feldsberg, sub.

here again the same problem: The onus is on the public to make the effort and I certainly think there should be some degree of public responsibility to contribute, most definitely.

But, I think, a great deal of onus is laid, perhaps on the smaller communities, for them to make the effort to make the journey to represent the community and to describe the community's logistics to a Panel or to researchers of the future who do not necessarily visit or understand the location of the community. As I said, likewise when this is done over the telephone or by letter, it is extremely frustrating and I wonder how valid it can be, certainly in the study-sense.

So, I raise that for your discussion, Mr. Chairman, and apart from that I have nothing further to raise and I thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation. I think, perhaps, that, subject to further discussion within the Panel, the least we might do is draw up a minimum list of communities that should be visited and studied by the proponent, and making that list subject to the general instruction to the proponent that should not be regarded as exhaustive.

I should point out here also that

Feldsberg, sub.

there are at least two members of this Panel who are residents of Labrador and who have extensive knowledge of its history, its people, its needs, who are very sensitive to the situation. I hope that the Panel can do a good thorough job of carrying out its mandate, giving proper attention to the needs of this area as to the other areas that may be impacted by the Project.

MRS. FELDSBERG: Doctor Barnes, just sort of one final point which I would raise, and that is, the northern universities in Canada have ethical guidelines in place for northern study. Are those being applied to this exercise?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed, we are aware of those guidelines and we will certainly advise the Department of National Defence that those should be followed in the course of this study.

I think Major McCabe wanted to say something at this point.

MAJOR McCABE: Mr. Chairman, in speaking on behalf of the proponent, I think I can reassure Mrs. Feldsberg that DND will, indeed, ensure that the researchers that are taken onto this Project to do the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Department of National Defence will cover those communities.

I think it goes without saying, that DND from time to time is very much a part of this

Feldsberg, sub.

local community here. We have been residents, albeit transient. We are usually here two to three years and in that time we certainly become very involved with the community and with the whole of the Labrador lifestyle, et cetera. During that time period we become very aware of all of those outlying communities that are affected directly or indirectly by the operations that we are involved with here. I am quite sure we will make the people, the company, or whatever, the consultants doing the study, we will make sure that they cover those areas because we know that they are important.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major, and thank you for your presentation, Mrs. Feldsberg. If you would kindly stay where you are for the moment, at the time that we were discussing sonic booms I believe a gentleman in the audience indicated that he would like to have something to say, and I wonder if he would come forward at this time and would you please identify yourself for the record.

MR. BEN MICHEL: My name is Ben Michel or Penoté Michel. While you were addressing the issue of sonic booms, I would like to read a section of what we got from the Red Flag describing the sonic booms and what produces the frequent sonic boom. It states:

" supersonic low level and higher

Feldsberg, sub.

> altitude flying, e.g. dogfighting, which would produce frequent sonic booms: In the southern U.S. States of Utah, Nevada and New Mexico and Texas supersonic aircraft produce frequently what is known as "carpet sonic booms", and even more intense focus and super focus booms, which crack walls in houses, blow out car windshields."

In this case we are not exactly sure what it would do to the wildlife population in whatever species there are out there, because caribou has been one of the major species that have been very much mentioned because of its size, and these are not the only wildlife populations that should be considered because as far as you can understand the book that is called "The Red Flag" there you can understand the situation.

As far as the other question that you have raised in regard to the sea exercises, I believe the Major had stated that there are and have been for quite some time exercises done in the Pacific and in Canada as well as in the United States. And, I do not see any reason as to why -- and, I believe it was the Chairman who said that there was not enough information, but I am sure the Panel members can find the information regarding

Feldsberg, sub.

the ship exercises, anti-ship exercising, that has been done in the United States and, I presume, in the sub-Arctic area as I believe the Major was mentioning; I am not exactly sure, but in Alberta as well he said, I believe.

It is just an observation, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Michel, and thank you, Mrs. Feldsberg, for your presentation.

Mr. Michel, I believe you indicated to me earlier that you wanted to have something to say on another subject. I wonder, since we have passed the appointed time to adjourn the meeting for lunch, whether you intend to come back this afternoon and whether it would be satisfactory to you to present that information at the afternoon session. Would that be all right? Thank you, then we will be sure to put you on first then if that is what you wish.

We will adjourn for lunch and we will return at 2:00 o'clock, please. Thank you very much.

---Luncheon adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before actually opening the meeting just a reminder for those of you who have not been here before, that there is a prohibition on smoking anywhere in this building, and that prohibition applies in this room and to the corridors outside the room. So, we would really appreciate your co-operation in that. The other administrative item is the fact that the washrooms are located downstairs.

At the beginning of the session this morning we presented a fairly detailed outline of the process that we are going through here. I think for the benefit of some people who may be here this afternoon for the first time I will just give a very abbreviated version of that. Those of you who wish to know more detail can certainly come to any of us or to one of the members of our Secretariat whenever you wish.

First of all, just briefly to introduce the individual members of the Panel, sitting at the end of the table on your left near the windows is Mr. Tom Northcott, who is a biologist, the Vice-President of a consulting firm in environmental matters, and a former employee of the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Next to him, Mr. Don Stewart, a retired Brigadier General from the Canadian Armed Forces, whose last position in the Forces was Deputy Commander of a NORAD region, and who was stationed for a time here in Goose Bay.

Next to him is, Mr. Tim who owns and operates a small business in Makkovik.

On my left, Mrs. Beatrice Watts, Director of the Native Curriculum Centre of Labrador, a former Mayor of Northwest River, and who has been involved in the National Status of Women Council and Labrador Legal Services.

Next is, Mr. William Jourdain, a Montagnais, resident in Sept Iles, Quebec, who has been active in Band affairs and commercial enterprises in that area; a former employee of the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

At the other end of the table, Doctor Paul Wilkinson, a biologist, who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of Northern Quebec, and who is currently a consultant based in Montreal.

I am the Atlantic Regional Director for the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa, and, as you may have gathered by now, the Chairman of this Panel that has been appointed by the Minister of Environment to conduct a public environmental review of certain existing and proposed military flying activities covering certain parts of Labrador and Quebec.

We are in the midst of a review of these military flying activities, a review which was initiated, I suppose you could put it, back in February of this year when the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment describing the Project and asking him to appoint a Panel to conduct a review. That Panel was appointed in July of this year, and given specific terms of reference for its conduct of the review based on the two identified components of the review; those being on the one hand the existing military low level flying activities, which have been ongoing for approximately six years, and on the other hand the proposal to establish a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay.

As a result of some fairly detailed consultations with interested parties and the information presented to the Panel by the support staff of the Environmental Assessment Office the Panel put together and published in August a document which we call "Draft Guidelines", the guidelines being intended as instructions to the Department of National Defence to be used in their preparation of one of the key documents of this whole review, the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are now in the midst of public meetings between conducted during September and October, the main purpose of which is to solicit comment from any interested party on the content of that draft document. In November the Panel will meet privately and consider all of the information received in these meetings and discuss possible modifications to that draft document to form the final guidelines which will be issued to the Department of National Defence probably in December of this year.

That will begin the process of

preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement, which will be done by the Department of National Defence at their own expense involving the review of existing information, the carrying out of certain new studies, perhaps, and the writing of a report, the Environmental Impact Statement, which we expect to be submitted to the Panel in late spring or early summer of 1987.

As soon as the Impact Statement is received by the Panel it will be distributed to the public, so it will, therefore, be available to the public and to the Panel and to the various governments involved; in fact, to any interested parties, probably during the summer and early fall of 1987.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory; that is, it has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines document previously issued, the Panel will announce public hearings to discuss the Project, and the most likely time for those hearings would be the fall of 1987.

The final step of the process, of the review, would involve the preparation of a report by the Panel, in which it will discuss the Project, its expected impacts on the natural, social, cultural, et cetera, environment, and discuss possible remedies for undesirable impacts and possible means of enhancing beneficial aspects coming from the proposal. It would also contain recommendations to government concerning each of the two components of the proposal. That report of the Panel will most likely be presented to the Ministers of Environment and National Defence in late 1987 or early 1988.

I mentioned a few moments ago that the Panel is supported by a Secretariat. I would like to introduce to you the Executive Secretary to the Panel Mr. Carrol Martin, who is seated over on the side of the room. Would you stand up briefly and identify yourself? He and his assistants on the Secretariat would be pleased to receive any requests for information. I would like to say, as I have many times before, that all of the information presented to this Panel is available to the public.

Now, there have been certain comments made about the procedures of the review. I would like to make a few things clear. First of all, this is not a judicial process that we are going through here. The process is designed, and we make every effort to make the process an informal one so that people will feel comfortable in participating and we hope that everyone who has any concerns that he wishes to raise or questions to ask will not feel shy about coming forward and speaking to this Panel. We are just ordinary folks like the rest of you, and we are anxious to listen to everyone that might have something to say that would be useful to the Panel in the conduct of this review.

Now, we have several speakers identified for this afternoon. First of all, carrying over from this morning's session, there was a gentleman who wished to say something to the Panel.

Excuse me, I am getting a little bit out of order here. I have forgotten to introduce an important person who is here at this meeting with us and I will get to the speakers afterwards. It is customary at all of these public meetings to invite along a representative of the developer; in this case, the Department of National Defence. Major David McCabe is seated over at the side of the room by the window. Major McCabe this morning gave a fairly detailed outline of what the Project actually is, and if there is time after the other speakers this afternoon, I am sure he would be willing to answer any questions any people have who were not here at previous sessions, and he may also be expected to respond from time to time if members of the audience or members of the Panel raise questions. So, feel free in the time allotted to put forward any questions through me to Major McCabe.

Now, to the speakers for this afternoon, first of all, as I promised, we will invite Mr. Ben Michel to come forward and make a presentation.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. BEN (Penoté) MICHEL:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Panel.

Michel, sub.

First of all, I would like to ask a question to the Panel members before I make my initial presentation. The question is or what I would like to raise with the members of the Panel: What constitutes population, because I think it is too broad a term in identifying what constitutes a population. The term seems to be used too broadly and I would like to know whether the process is willing to specify more specifically what constitutes population, or the term "population" that has been used very broadly here.

THE CHAIRMAN: This would be the term population in connection with animals and plants, that sort-of-thing?

MR. MICHEL: Yes, as well as people.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I will ask the two biologists on the Panel to respond each in turn. Doctor Wilkinson, would you like to make a comment on that.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I think the first comment I would make is that we were using the term, I think, in a common sense way with its common sense meaning; not with its technical meaning. I think that we use the term in relation to the humans occupying the area as well as to animal populations.

As far as the humans are concerned, I think we used two words. We used the word "group"

Michel, sub.

and we used the word "population".

In our meetings in drafting the guidelines we did not, as best as I recall it, spend any time discussing the precise meanings of those terms. We used two words just to make sure the interpretation that would have to be given to our document would be as large as possible; that the proponent would have to consult everybody who is in the area that might be affected by the Project.

MR. MICHEL: The intent of my question was not to involve, as you say, in terms of interventions or what-have-you, because, obviously, the animals will not be able to intervene. But, at the same time for tactical reasons I think because of the ecology and the worry that one has in terms of the environment and disruption as well as the possibility of wildlife disruption in the two phases the proponent is trying to establish here - one of them, the present activity that is current at this point, and the possibility of a NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre being established here.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Perhaps, I could understand it better if I could ask you if you think that there is a better term to use?

MR. MICHEL: I am not sure whether there is a better term to use but in terms of analysing

Michel, sub.

and evaluating the effects or the possible effects and the possible damage cf, then I think it should be quite specific as to how you categorize the meaning of the word or what constitutes population.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: In the biological sense the population of animals is a breeding unit of animals. So I mean a given herd could be broken down into a number of populations. The population is the unit within which genetic exchange occurs, and our intentions by asking for the effects on populations to be studied was not that just very gross overall statements should be made, but that the impacts of the Project on smaller units of animals should be studied, if it were appropriate.

MR. MICHEL: I think there are a number of different species, small or otherwise, and still it might have some detrimental effects on whatever species there are out there. Thank you.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: If I could just clarify, I think our intention, and we will look at the document again to make sure we did it, was certainly that all species in the area should be studied and that within each species each individual population that could be affected should also be studied to the level, the depth required, and if the document does not say that we will have make sure that it is revised to do so.

MR. MICHEL: Yes, and the second and

Michel, sub.

last question probably I have has something to do with the proponent, and I do not know whether I can differentiate the proponent from the government, in it also being the objective, or the objective instrument or supposedly to be the objective instrument in this whole process. Inasfar as your guidelines are concerned I am questioning it in that fashion, and inasfar as the terms of reference are concerned, and as far as the validity of the whole process is concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose that some people look at the Government of Canada or any other government and see it as a single big unit rather than as being composed of various different agencies, particularly people who, perhaps, do not have a lot to do with the government, or who -- well, anyway let us leave it at that.

The fact is, that the Government of Canada, like any other, is made up of several departments some of which provide the services, some being regulatory in nature. We like to feel that the process that we are involved in here sets up a Panel which is, to a great degree, independent in its function. Granted that I, as the Chairman of the Panel, happen to be an employee of the government. When I function as the Chairman of the Panel I have a different relationship to the government. I no longer report to my superior within

g
hether
be the
inasfar
tioning
ns of
validity
some
any
it
rent
do not
nt
al
ces,
eel
re sets
ndent
airman
he
of the
e
within

Michel, sub.

the Environmental Assessment Review Office. I have a direct reporting relationship to the Minister, and, of course, it cannot be forgotten that the remuneration to the Panel members and their expenses and all that sort of thing does come from the government coffers. I do not know how that could be set up any other way,but the effort is there to set up a Panel which can be objective in its point of view and, indeed, the office which provides the administrative support to the Panel operates at arm's length from the Department of Environment, for example.

The Executive Chairman, who is the head of our office, reports directly to the Minister of Environment rather than through any part of Environment Canada. Now, that may not entirely satisfy everybody, but I think it is an honest effort of the government to set up a review system which, to a great degree, can be objective and apart from the government.

MR. MICHEL: Yes, that may be very true, Mr. Chairman. The Panel members may be, to a point, at arm's length with the government but at the same time I fail to understand, as I said, the objectivity and the validity of the government as the government is the proponent, and the government has very much publicly blessed the intent of DND at this, and they have made public statements to that

Michel, sub.

very fact, and still it makes me wonder how on the one hand specifically the Department of the Environment, which is a part of the whole of the government; as is the DND in this whole picture, can say on the one hand we will do an evaluated analysis of -- an objective evaluation, and objective analysis of the possibility of a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training being established here as well as the current low level flying that is currently happening here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think beyond the explanation and assurances that I have given there is not much more that I can say. The sort of points that you are raising are of a nature which put into question the whole environmental assessment review process, of which we are a part, and I do not believe we can get into a discussion of the merits of that process within this forum. The process is what the process is.

MR. MICHEL: No, my intent, Mr. Chairman, is not to deal with the merits or the unfounding principles of the whole process, but just to state on record.

If I may go on ahead with my presentation, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

"Argument and Information regarding the Innu Position Against Military Training Activities in Nitassinan (The Quebec Labrador Peninsula):

Michel, sub.

Innu refers to the indigenous people of Quebec and Labrador, also known as Montagnais-Naskapi Indians. Nitassinan, literally "our land", is the name they use for their homeland; also spelled N-t-e-s-i-n-a-n. Innu is not to be confused with Inuit or Eskimo.

Present military training activities based in Goose Bay:

1. The German Air Force operates with about 22 aircraft of which maybe 15 are Phantom II F4Fs and the rest Alpha jets. Both of these jets seem to restrict their activities to daytime and good weather sorties. Phantom IIs have been seen flying low level by the Innu in both the northern and southern low level flying zones. The Alpha jets may also be flying low level or else conducting a more basic level of training. There were about eight German Tornados training out of Goose Bay last August during a two-week period. German low level flying started for the 1985 season April 1, 1985 and ended on October 18, 1985. They may be back this year as early as the end of February.

2. The Royal Air Force is currently operating about 8-10 Tornado GR1 (IDS variant) aircraft, possibly with some night flying. The maximum number of Tornados permitted to train here under present bilateral agreements is about 20.

Michel, sub.

3. The USAF conducts periodic low level flying with C-130 and C-141 aircraft and participates with fighter aircraft, AWACS, et cetera, in major annual exercises such as AMALGAM BRAVE (May and June) which is primarily a NORAD mission. The USAF also undertakes various military manoeuvres such as the rapid deployment exercises at the old Twin Falls airstrip, just south of Churchill Falls, and undertakes "Operation Reforger" whereby troops and supplies in Germany are replenished, using C-141B Starlifter transport aircraft.

4. Apparently, the CAF participates in low level training in support of major exercises. Four CF-18s will be stationed at Goose Bay in 1987 for the purpose of forward northern interception of Soviet Bear H bombers, et cetera.

5. A war game labelled "Operation Lightening Strike" was conducted in the Lake Melville Region of Labrador in January, 1986 involved 900 CAF tropps, tracked armoured vehicles and fighter aircraft based in Bagotville, Quebec. We may see many more of these manoeuvres in the region in the near future.

Why the Innu Oppose?

In May, 1985, Innu representatives from the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, Davis Inlet, Sheshatshit, St-Augustin, La Romaine, Natashquan and Mingan Band Councils signed a

Michel, sub.

declaration demanding a complete cessation to the military training activity in their territory. The Innu want the Canadian government and its NATO Allies to terminate plans to build the NATO base in Goose Bay and to halt the existing low level training activities. The reasons for adopting such an adamant position are as follows:

1. Present training activities are disturbing the wildlife and are making life miserable for the Innu who live in the country in regions where low level flying is occurring. The NATO base would make life in the flying zones virtually impossible.

2. The Quebec/Labrador Peninsula is "one of the few remaining regions of the world still relatively free of maiming" - Midas Touch of Humanity. "The NATO base will change all this and quite possibly have a severe impact on the environment of the region."

3. The training activities are taking place on Innu territory which has never been ceded to the Canadian state by way of treaty or land claims agreement, and is, therefore, rightfully the property of the Innu people. Such training activities and various Euro-Canadian economic initiatives seriously prejudice Innu rights and land claims and must, therefore, not take place without the permission of the Innu.

Michel, sub.

4. The kinds of training activities that are occurring at the moment and which will be expanded if the NATO base is built; for example: "Deep Strike" and other emerging technologies are destablizing and lower the threshold for a nuclear war. The Tornado GR1 used by the British is assigned a nuclear role in NATO and has replaced the older Vulcan and Buccaneer aircraft in this capacity. According to an Economist Report, September 1982, page 61, by 1990 Tornados and Trident missiles will be assigned 724 separate targets for nuclear strikes. One hundred are assigned to Tornados. It is likely that some of the training activities using these aircraft in Quebec and Labrador simulate nuclear weapons delivery. The Innu consider themselves a peaceful people and do not want their territory to be used so that more powerful nations can better perfect their weapons of destruction.

The main problem for the Innu at this time is with low level flight training carried out by the German Luftwaffe using primarily Phantom IIs and the British Royal Air Force using Tornados. According to both Innu and settler, (Inuit and white descent) reports, the aircraft fly so low that their exhaust makes waves on the surface of lakes and rivers, ripples the canvas on tents, sways trees, et cetera. The German armed forces has confirmed the suspicion that the Phantom IIs fly as

Michel, sub.

low as 100 feet off the ground. The aircraft pass singly, in tandem, side by side, two to four one after the other, or, as many as four in low level formation. On occasion the pilots have spotted Innu encampments or hunting parties and have purposely changed direction so as to fly over them. Pilots have also engaged in hot dogging over Innu hunting parties and camps, e.g. by standing the aircraft on end over a camp or hunting party; kicking in the afterburners and shooting straight up into the air above the heads of the Innu.

The amazing lack of discipline shown here by these pilots has also been documented in certain regions of Europe. The "Calling on Auntie" in phenomena in Britian, for example, where undisciplined pilots fly low level at supersonic speeds over restricted population centres, has given rise to considerable protest. After having been buzzed by an American pilot in a F-111 jet, the residents of Finzean, Scotland "skeptically viewed a MoD leaflet stating: 'Military low flying is strictly controlled and no more is done than is essential. Each flight is the subject of careful planning. Military pilots do not just fly as and where they like'."

The Innue say that the extremely loud and unexpected noise generated by low-flying aircraft is extremely traumatic especially for the

Michel, sub.

young and the elderly. They report that on occasion their children have jumped out of canoes and into the water and have run into the forest to seek refuge from the jets. Other children have left their camps and run into the forest and their parents have experienced some difficulty finding them afterwards. Many Innu men feel they cannot leave their hunting camps to check more distant traplines because they are worried about the adverse reaction of their children to the overflights. Innu report that after an overflight they experience a ringing in their ears, which may last up to one hour.

The country where the Innu live and hunt is extremely quiet, except for the odd chain saw, gun shot, and limited camp noise of children and adults conversing, chopping wood, et cetera. Away from the camps it is so quiet you can hear yourself breath and even the sound of the canoe paddles flicking the water seems like a lot of noise.

The sudden arrival of a noisy jet is obviously a nasty contrast to the tranquility and solitude normally present in the country. Apparently, during the fall of 1983, a number of Innu children from La Romaine had to return to the community because of their fear of the aircraft. Some Innu have said that they will never again go out in the country for the fall as long as the low level flights continue because of the loud, unexpected noise is just too traumatic for them and their

Michel, sub.

children.

CAF Says Aircraft Can Avoid Innu Camps:

The CAF claims it can reduce the negative impact of low level flying on the Innu by getting the pilots to treat the Innu camps like enemy missile installations and to avoid them because of this. However, one must take issue with this claim.

1. The Innu do not sit on their rear ends all day at camp. The men, including boys, may travel up to 25 miles from the base camp to check traps and distant beaver lodges or follow caribou tracks. The women and younger children will also travel some distance from camp, e.g. three miles, to gather berries and hunt small game. The military cannot avoid the Innu when they are away from camp.

2. CAF knowledge of the location of Innu camps in the past has not stopped overflights and will not stop them in the future. The problems experienced by rural Europeans in attempting to stop overflights of their farms and homes will testify to the difficulties the Innu are likely to experience in getting the military to stop overflights of their camps and hunting, trapping and gathering parties.

3. With the NATO base or even more bilateral agreements between Canada and other

Michel, sub.

NATO countries the number of low level flights will increase to the point where it will be impossible to avoid Innu camps let alone hunting parties.

4. With air-to-air training there will likely be frequent sonic booms, which will impact on the Innu even if the aircraft are some distance from the camps.

5. During the spring, the Innu move camp frequently, four to five times, as snow conditions and water levels change. The Innu do not want to report their movements in the country like children to mother. Moreover, they believe that notifying the military as to their whereabouts is tantamount to saying that they accept the military presence on their land.

6. This does not answer the question of how the jets can avoid wildlife upon which the Innu depend.

Which Innu are affected?

There are approximately 9,000 Innu in Nitassinan. They live in the following communities: Pointe Bleue, Les Escoumains, Bersimis, Sept-Iles/Maliotenam, Matimekush (Schefferville), Kauauatshikimatsh (Schefferville), Mingan, Natashquan, La Romaine, St-Augustin, Sheshatshit and Davis Inlet.

There are approximately 2,000 Innu who may be engaged in harvesting activities at any

Michel, sub.

one time in areas where low level flying is occurring; i.e. in the two low level flying zones. These Innu come from the communities of Davis Inlet, total population: 350; Sheshatshit, 670; St-Augustin, 150; La Romaine, 650; Natashquan, 500; Mingan, 350; Matimekush (Schefferville), 600; and Kauauatshikimatch (Schefferville), 400. Thus, the total number of Innu who are affected by the military activities is in the order of 3,600-4,000 people. Members of the community of Sept-Iles/Maliotenam, 2,000, may also be affected when they are hunting caribou North of Schefferville in the northern low level flight zone.

The hunting territories of two communities, Natashquan and La Romaine, are entirely within the southern low level flying zone. In the fall of 1983, which was the first year that low level flights were experienced by Innu from La Romaine, there were 500 members of this community living in the country in the southern low level flying zone based in 18 different hunting camps.

Most Innu live in the country during the fall; that is, between mid-September and mid-December. This includes men, women and children. The Innu from Sheshatshit, however, also live in the country in the spring from the beginning of April to the end of June. Innu men from Schefferville and the Quebec north shore, e.g. La Romaine, probably do not encounter aircraft in the country while they

Michel, sub.

are hunting caribou after Christmas because at the moment they are no low level flights during January, February and March, which is when most of the Innu from these areas are hunting caribou. They use skidoos or aircraft to reach areas where caribou are concentrated.

Innu family harvesting on the Quebec north shore is primarily confined to the coast or a maximum of about 20 miles inland during the spring, summer and early fall, and so Innu in these regions are not likely to experience any overflights. A few Innu from the Quebec north shore experience overflights during the summer when they are on fishing trips 20-30 miles inland; e.g. in the vicinity of Lake Musquaro, northwest of La Romaine.

Military Expansion in the Quebec/ Labrador Peninsula:

The number of aircraft training low level will increase according to DND even if the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is not built. This will occur under bilateral agreements with individual NATO countries; e.g. the Dutch and the Italians have expressed interest in training here on this basis. Thus, we may soon see 100 or more aircraft training out of Goose Bay on a regular basis under bilateral agreements. As the numbers of air forces training increases and as the numbers of aircraft and crews

Michel, sub.

rotating through and the base increases, the present flying season will be extended later in the fall and earlier in the winter.

If a NATO base is constructed in Goose Bay, life in the country may very well become impossible for the Innu. There are a number of reasons for this, which are as follows:

(a) increased low level flying, and therefore, increased exposure to the loud and unexpected noise generated by the low-flying aircraft. According to Lieutenant-Colonel David, CAF Commander, Goose Bay, there are presently about 40,000 movements out of Goose Bay each year of which roughly 10 per cent are involved with military low level flight activities; i.e. 4,000.

It is hard to estimate the extent to which the number of low level flights will increase in Quebec and Labrador but if the present number of such flights in Europe are any indication, then the increase could be significant indeed. For example, the number of low level flights in Britain in 1984 was 133,250 of which 82 per cent were by British armed forces; 17 per cent, USAF; and one per cent, other (John Lee, UK Secretary of State for Defence, July 23, 1984).

If even a portion of these low level training operations are exported to Nitassinan from each NATO country, there could be substantially

Michel, sub.

greater numbers of low level flights occurring there on a daily basis.

(b) supersonic low level and higher altitude flying; e.g. dogfighting, which would produce frequent sonic booms. In the southern United States of Utah, Nevada, New Mexico and Texas, supersonic aircraft produce frequent carpet sonic booms and even more intense focus and superfocus booms, which crack the walls in houses, blow out car windshields, et cetera.

(c) the presence of three to four bombing ranges with intensive flying activity occurring within a certain radius of each one. The first one was surveyed last September and will probably be built during the summer of 1986, 12 miles south of Lac Minipi, just north of the southern Quebec/Labrador border.

(d) there is good reason to believe than an important component of the training that will come with the NATO base will be Electronic Counter Measures (ECM) and electronic surveillance. At least one Instrumented Air Combat Manoeuvring Range (IACMR) will be built. The concern here is with the levels of Radio Frequency Radiation (RF), that may be generated by the low-flying aircraft, ECM ground stations, IACMR, AWACS, et cetera. Opponents of low level and supersonic military flying in Nevada argue, that high levels of RF radiation in areas where these kind of training activities are

Michel, sub.

conducted may pose a serious health problem to the people exposed to it. However, little is presently known about the health effects of exposure to RF radiation.

We should note that, that the IACMR would consist of substantial tracts of land which may be single use areas; that is, lands where civilians are not permitted to enter. Radar systems, simulated missile sites, ECM units, et cetera, would be placed along the river valleys throughout the range to monitor or score the aircraft as they fly through and to challenge them with ECM.

Low level flights would take place in this area with extreme frequency. The IACMR would probably have a bombing range located in one portion of it. On the IACMR near Nellis Air Force in Nevada, pilots fly low level around a 35-mile circuit. The Primrose Lake bombing range in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan is three million acres in size and native people are not allowed to hunt, trap or fish inside its boundaries.

With a large military installation in place in Goose Bay, NATO will want the option of using live ammunition on the bombing ranges. According to CAF public statements, present plans for bombing practice entail the use of cold smoke bombs.

Who know what will occur in the future?

Above and beyond the problems

Michel, sub.

identified here, it is fair to say, that with a NATO base in Goose Bay the training activities will change from year to year as NATO training requirements and technology changes. Who knows what kind of training will occur in the Innu homeland should the base be built in Goose Bay?

Impact Assessments:

Caribou Study. There is presently one study taking place on the impact of the low level flying problem. This is a $300 thousand study of the impact on caribou conducted by Dr. Fred Harrington of Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The purpose of this two-year research program, completion date December, 1987, is to quantitatively investigate the effects of low level flying by jet and propeller-driven aircraft upon the behaviour and population dynamics of caribou of the Red Wine and George River herds. The main emphasis is on the Red Wine herd. The study does not include an assessment of the impact of sonic booms on caribou. Source: study proposal by Dr. Fred H. Harrington, June, 1985, to Newfoundland Wildlife Division.

Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO). During the September Military Awareness meetings held in 27 Labrador communities, DND announced that it would subject the proposed military expansion in the region to

Michel, sub.

a review by FEARO. This, possibly more extensive assessment, would commence in 1986 and take two years to complete. As of February 3, 1986, the Minister of Environment had still not received an official request from DND asking that such an impact assessment be done.

Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA). In June, 1985, the Newfoundland Minister of Health announced that he would be asked the CPHA to conduct an independent inquiry into the impact of low level flying on human health. The CPHA has agreed tentatively to conduct a study, the results of which would be available at the end of 1986. Terms of reference have not yet been announced.

You will note that none of these studies will be completed until after NATO makes a final decision about whether to build the base in Goose Bay or Konya, Turkey. This raises a number of serious questions:

(a) if the impact of the military training activities is shown to be detrimental to humans and the natural environment, it will be too late to do anything about it because Canada will already have agreed to the construction of the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay. I must mention also that it is not only the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons or the construction of the NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre affecting

Michel, sub.

or impacting upon the humans or the environment that will come about, but also the current low level flying that is happening already today.

(b) assuming that NATO wants to build the base in Goose Bay, the Canadian government will not be able to take into consideration any mitigative measures proposed in the studies when negotiating with NATO the kinds of training activities that will take place in Quebec and Labrador. A final report from a study group assessing the relative merits of Konya and Goose Bay will be finished in the spring of 1986. The formal decision from NATO about the base will be announced in the fall of 1986.

(c) this is another example of the "screwed up" environmental impact assessment procedure in this country. Environmental impact studies are conducted not prior to but after final decisions are made to proceed with massive developments which may impact significantly on the people and the environment.

Deep Strike: What is it all about?

"Follow On Forces Attack" or "Deep Strike" is a new NATO warfighting concept first articulated by General Bernard Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and approved by the NATO Defence Planning Committee on November 9, 1984. The object of Deep Strike is to increase NATOs ability to hit targets deep inside Warsaw Pact territory with

Michel, sub.

conventional weapons. The aim, in the event of a Warsaw Pact attack, is to cut front line forces off from their reinforcements or support facilities. NATO has always had a deep interdiction strategy.

What makes Deep Strike new is that:

(1) it emphasizes the use of new types of conventional missiles to carry out the missions presently assigned to theatre nuclear weapons;

(2) it relies on the management of the battlefield by sophisticated computer systems for surveillance, data fusion, and target acquisition; and

(3) it is based on a "Spirit of Offence" in manoeuverability rather than the present doctrine of "Forward Defence" - static linear defence along the east-west border and the use of massive firepower to stop Warsaw Pact aggression. In other words, in Deep Strike, war would be fought with winning as the goal rather than the achievement of a stalemate or a halt to the aggression which precipitated it.

Some European countries, such as Britain and West Germany, argue that much of the deep interdiction role can still be conducted with aircraft such as the Panavia Tornado GR1. The Tornado's ground-mapping and terrain-following radar and inertial navigation system make it a manned cruise

Michel, sub.

missile. Its main advantage will lie in an improved ability to penetrate enemy defences to deliver weapons at low level in all weather and at any time of day or night (John Nott, British Secretary for Defence, 1981).

The low level flight training presently taking place in Quebec and Labrador is definitely part of Deep Strike. The Tornado, in conjunction with conventional missiles; e.g. cruise missiles, are intended to fly deep inside East Bloc territory to attack airfields, fuel dumps, highway junctions, bridges, second echelon (reserve) troops, tanks, supply vehicles, missile sites, bunkers for storage of nuclear weapons, early warning radars, C-3 installations (command, control and communications), et cetera. That is what C-3 installations are: Command, control and communications.

Some of the new weapon systems being developed to accomplish these tasks include the following:

(a) Assault Breaker, includes a wide area surveillance system, which will be able to identify moving ground targets. Labelled JSTARS, Joint Surveillance and Target Acquisition Radar System, this system would be mounted on C-18 or OV-1D aircraft. Assault Breaker would also include a short range missile; e.g. Lance and Patriot, that would break open over the battlefield and spew out hundreds

Michel, sub.

of terminally guided submunitions that would seek out and engage individual targets.

(b) MILSTAR, a new satellite to provide long range jam-resistant communications and will be ready in the early 1990s.

(c) JTIDS (Joint Tactical Information Distribution System) - a jam-resistant system for data and voice transmission.

(d) GPS (Global Positioning System) - a satellite guidance system for cruise missiles.

(e) PLSS (Precision Location Strike System) - an airborne sensor system to be mounted on TR-1 aircraft and co-ordinated with JSTARS. It would locate and identify radio-emitting sources including jammers.

(f) LONG RANGE MISSILES - adapted Pershing II (CAM-40) and Trident (AXE) missiles to hit distant airfields, C-3 installations, et cetera.

(g) CRUISE MISSILES - modified Cruise missiles to deliver submunitions, etc. on airfields and other targets; e.g. LRSOM (Long Range Stand-off Missile) would be based on the British P3T Sea Eagle anti-shipping Cruise missile and could be carried by the Tornado GR1, which is in place in Goose Bay right now which the British are using.

(h) SDVA (Skeet Delivery Vehicle Assembly) - hit tanks with self-forging fragment

Michel, sub.

warheads, personnel and lightly armoured vehicles, which were used in the practices of last year.

(i) Incredible Hulk, a missile with a payload up to 25 tons that could destroy an entire airforce base. It would use booster components from Thor, Delta and/or Saturn space rockets.

(j) BTM (Bunkered Target Munition) - would be carried on the CAM-40 missile, Cruise missiles or Tornados to destroy bunkers for C-3, fuel and nuclear weapons, storage, et cetera.

(k) JP233 - a British produced submunitions dispenser to deliver runway cratering bombs and area denial minutes.

(1) MW1 - a West German produced submunitions dispenser which ejects the submunitions sideways from 112 tubes. Similar role to the British JP233. The Tornado already carries both the British JP233 and the German MW1.

The total cost of research, development and acquisition of the proposed Deep Strike system is $20 billion, plus or minus 50 per cent over a 10-year period. General Rogers of SACEUR has proposed an increased expenditure of one per cent per year over this period on the part of each NATO country in order to pay for the system. Note: the R&D costs for Starwars are estimated at $26 billion.

A basic premise of Deep Strike is the idea that an improved conventional deterrent will

Michel, sub.

raise the nuclear threshold and de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons in NATO strategy. NATO's conventional capabilities are considered inadequate to meet the growing Warsaw Pact threat, and as a result NATO must depend on the use of theatre nuclear weapons for defence and deterrents. Deep Strike, NATO argues, will shift the battlefield onto Warsaw Pact territory, and eliminate the need for battlefield nuclear weapons and eventually replace them entirely.

Critics of Deep Strike on the other hand argue that it is de-stabilizing and that it lowers the threshold for a nuclear war. Three main reasons for this are as follows:

1. Deep Strike blurs the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons due to

(a) the quasi-nuclear nature of the weapons to be deployed, which are almost as destructive as small nuclear devices and can perform the same missions; e.g. Incredible Hulk and Assault Breaker, and

(b) the delivery systems are dual capable.

The Tornado GR1, Cruise missiles, and adapted Pershing II and Trident missiles are also intended to deliver nuclear warheads, if so desired. "If NATO launched an attack deep inside Warsaw Pact territory with

Michel, sub.

with cruise or ballistic missiles, and nuclear capable Tornados, how would the Soviets know the attack was a conventional and not a nuclear one? A missile or plane does not announce on a radar screen what kind of warhead it is carrying. In the 'fog of war' could NATO be absolutely certain that the Soviets would not mistake a conventional missile for a nuclear one? This is also posed by Soviet SS-21s, SS-22a, and SS-23s, which can be rigged to carry conventional, chemical, or nuclear warheads. So the problem is not just NATO's" (Hampson, 1985, pages 17 and 18.

2. Deep Strike is a doctrine of deep penetration of Warsaw Pact territory. In the event of a war, deep strikes against Warsaw Pact Soviet strategic installations such as early warning radars and missiles, air defence systems, C-3, et cetera, could seriously threaten the Warsaw Pact governments and provoke them to escalate rapidly to the Nuclear level and pre-emptive strikes by the Soviets.

Deep Strike stresses offence rather than the concept of static linear defence, which the present doctrine of Forward Defence is based on. The emphasis of winning the war; not just accepting a stalemate or halt to the Warsaw Pact aggression may also be seriously de-stabilizing, and, in the event of a war could provoke the Soviets into

Michel, sub.

using nuclear weapons so as to avoid defeat and a possible invasion by NATO forces.

3. NATO stresses publicly that Deep Strike is strictly a conventional doctrine. However, this may be little more than a public relations pill to make Deep Strike more palatable for consumption by the West European public. In practice, Deep Strike could turn out to be very similar to AirLand Battle, a U.S. army doctrine which openly calls for offensive deep thrusts into Warsaw Pact territory and the integration of nuclear, conventional and chemical warfighting.

That is basically my presentation, Mr. Chairman, except for the references concerning Deep Strike, which maybe I should address.

References Concerning Deep Strike, Low Level and Supersonic Training Activities in the U.S., Britain, Germany and Canada:

1. DEEP STRIKE. Berg, Per and Gunilla Herolf. 1984. "Deep Strike": New technologies for conventional interdiction. SIPRI Yearbook, 291-318.

Canby, Steven L. 1985. "The Operational Limits of Emerging Technology," International Defence Review. 18 (6): page 875-879.

Dankbaar, Ben. 1984. "Alternative Defence Policies and the Peace Movement", Journal of Peace Research, 21 (2), pages 141-153.

Michel, sub.

Gessert, Robert A. 1984. "The Airland Battle and Nato's New Doctrinal Debate", Rusi Journal. 129 (2), pages 52-60.

Hampson, Fen Osler. 1985. "The Role of New technologies and Follow-On Forces Attach in NATO Strategy". Paper presented at the Conference on European Security and the MBFR Talks, University of Toronto, May 6-7.

Kaldor, Mary et al. 1985. "NATO at the Crossroads", END Journal. 18 (October and November): 14-17.

Klare, Michael T. 1984. "Conventional Arms, Military Doctrine and Nuclear War: the Vanishing Firebreak", Thought. 59 (232).

"New NATO strategy uses 'smart' arms", Globe and Mail, October 23, 1985.

2. Goose Bay Military Training Activities and Expansion:

"Canada offers Goose Bay in NATO-base contest", Globe and Mail, October 25, 1985.

Crosbie, John C. Remarks regarding the future of the Goose Bay Airport. Press Conferences in St. John's and Happy Valley-Goose Bay, June 28, 1985.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Press Statement re: Military training activity in Labrador. Press Conferences in St. John's and Happy Valley-Goose Bay, June 28, 1985.

Michel, sub.

Government of Newfoundland Labrador. Letter from Stuart Luttich, Regional Wildlife Biologist, Newfoundland Wildlife Division, to Greg Andrew, Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, November 11, 1983.

Landry, George. 1981. An Initial Environmental Evaluation on a Proposal to Conduct Low Level Flying Training from Goose Bay, Labrador, DND, Directorate of Air Plans.

Memorandum of Understanding between the Minister of National Defence of Canada and the Federal Minister of Defence of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning German air force training in Canada at Goose Bay, 1983.

Military Awareness Meeting. Happy Valley-Goose Bay Vocational School, September 16, 1985. Transcript of taped proceedings.

NATO Press Statement, December 7, 1983, announcing an agreement between West Germany and Canada for low level flight training in Quebec and Labrador covering the period January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1993.

3. Low Level Flights in Europe, U.S. and other parts of Canada:

"Calling on Auntie at 1,600 mph", Sunday Standard, December 6, 1981.

English, Malcolm. 1980. "Buccaneer Strike", Air Pictorial. August: 292-297.

Michel, sub.

Federal Republic of Germany, Minister of Defence White Paper 1985, "The Situation and the Development of the Federal Armed Forces", Section 355 under environmental protection.

Giangrande, Carole. 1983. The Nuclear North: the People, the Regions, and the Arms Race. Toronto: Anansi.

Hillinger, Charles. 1985. "Nevadans Sounds Off on Navy's Plan: Proposed Supersonic Testing Ground Debated", Los Angeles Times, January 10.

"Hunt for 'cowboy' jet after Isles damage", Scotsman, September 16, 1983.

"Important contribution towards a reduction of noise from aircraft", Provincial Parliamentarian, Walter Mallmann, leads parliamentary delegation to Canada, translated from Hunsruker Zeitung, West Germany, July 18, 1985.

"In nice weather all hell breaks loose in the skies", translated from article "Wenn schones Wetter ist, dann ist am Himmel die Holle los", which appeared in the German weekly news magazine, Stern, October, 1985.

"Jets scream in with noisy secret", Sunday Standard, August 9, 1981.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Michel, excuse me for a moment; I wonder if you have a very lengthy list of references --

Michel, sub.

MR. MICHEL: I am just about done, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just thinking it could serve the same purpose to provide a copy to the Secretariat, if you wish. If you have only a few items left, then go ahead.

MR. MICHEL: There are only about 10 more left.

Kolata, Gina. 1984. "Waiting for Sonic Booms", Science, 226: 146-148.

Lambert, Mark and Tom Hamill. 1979. "Luftwaffe in Europe's Front Line", Flight International, September 1: 680-689.

"Low-flying Aircraft: 'Almost like war'", translated from article "Tiefflieger: 'Beinahe wie im Krieg'", which appeared in the German weekly news magazine Der Spiegel, August 20, 1984.

Merkur, Rheinischer. 1985. "Low-flying fighters give land-bound Germans the screaming jets", The German Tribune, June 2, number 1181.

Mohr, Charles. 1985. "For Fighter Pilot, Realism on Range", New York Times, May, 1985.

"More low-level flights in Canada and Turkey?", translated from Westfalen-Blatt, West Germany, July 8, 1985.

"Not only noice, but also fear", Scotsman, April 15, 1983.

"Peace in our time", The Guardian,

Michel, sub.

March 5, 1982.

"RAF looks at Canada for low-flying training", Flight International, October 27, 1979.

Reply from John Lee, U.K. Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence Procurement, to Dafydd Elis Thomas, MP, July 23, 1984.

"Screaming hell: Concorde pilot raps U.S. snub over jet noise", Oxford Journal, October 18, 1984.

Sloan, Jim. 1985. "Rural Westerners sick of military operations", Reno Gazette-Journal, November 24.

"'Tornado terror' in Sutherland", Press Journal, July 24, 1984.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Michel. I wonder if you would remain there for a moment. I would ask if any member of the Panel wishes to raise any point of clarification with Mr. Michel and his presentation? Would any member of the audience care to put a question, perhaps for clarification, to Mr. Michel? If not, then thank you again, Mr. Michel.

MR. MICHEL: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am now going to call for a break in the meeting. I think we will adjourn for approximately 10 minutes and I understand there are refreshments available at the back of the room. Thank you.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speakers are three persons associated with the Makami Project Group: Mr. Steve Michelin, Ms. Claris Rudkowski, and I understand Mr. Strachen is going to --

MISS RUDKOWSKI: Mr. Strachen had to leave.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. I will ask each of you in turn, as you speak to us, to tell us your affiliation with the organization and to proceed with your presentation please.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. STEVE MICHELIN:

The opportunity to speak to you on the Draft Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on Military Flying Activity in Labrador and Quebec is appreciated by the Makomi Project Group. The group is made up of representation from the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador North Chamber of Commerce, and the Makomi Regional Development Association; that comprises the board of the Makomi Project Group, and I am the Project Officer.

I think the Panel is to be congratulated on the obvious depth and scope of its perception of the issue as well as its willingness to travel to the far reaches of the country to determine the extent the impact the proposed projects will have on such areas as St. John's and Montreal.

We, the Makomi Project Group, having

Michelin, sub.

been funded at our request, to promote development in Labrador in general and currently in Goose Bay in particular, are very sensitive to the ramifications of this set of hearings and wish to see the Panel conduct them according to the rules.

We were of the understanding that this initial set of hearings was for discussion of the Draft Guidelines, but having read the transcript from La Romaine and being here this afternoon it becomes evident that the protests and the full-fledged presentations were permitted and we were not quite aware of that or we may have had a more lengthy presentation prepared.

One has to assume that the presenters from outside the community were invited by the community, and those presentations have been pre-scheduled.

We have come to this set of hearings not prepared to argue the merits of low level flying activity or economic development, but to discuss the ground rules and any problems that we might have with the guidelines; not in a confrontatious manner but in the hope of clarification. We, being very poorly equipped or trained to do these types of things, as you will find many of the native Labrador groups who will appear you; we, like them, rely on basic honesty and what we know and the respect for the authority that we perceive the

Michelin, sub.

government to have to try and understand what you are proposing to do.

Our principal points of concern are ones that we have picked from your draft and which we would like to bring to your attention for clarification, or whatever; some things that we are not quite clear on.

The first concern is with the introduction on page four, where it is stated but yet unproven that the projects --

> "which are likely to have significant adverse environmental effects..."

is the basis for doing the EIS studies, but from what perspective and whose definition are the effects to be significantly adverse? If it was strictly an environmental thing, we could see the possibility of having adverse effects, but we are under the understanding that this is environmental, socio and economical.

I do not think the whole thing should be in the context of having an adverse effect on everything is it is going to include social and the economical aspect of it.

Item two: It is very pleasing to the Makomi Group that the guidelines apply to the entire Project right up to the termination and the demobilization, because too often the effects of the shutdown of a Project can be socially

Michelin, sub.

and environmentally more traumatic than the other phases, and that has already been experienced in Labrador. We went through that about 10 years this week, apparently.

Item three is on page 27, the second paragraph:

> "The description of the environment must include a survey of the aspirations of the native and non-native residents.".

We would ask that this be more clearly explained or more fully explained, and a clearly defined statement on who are native and non-native, as it relates to this study.

When they say, a survey of the aspirations of the people, we would like to know if this constitutes referendum or just a random survey or what type of format this would take.

Item four, under the procedures for public review, paragraph three, page two, it is stated that:

> "The Panel will not accept any information which cannot be made public."

What information of a military-sensitive nature might be required under the guidelines we are not quite aware of. Some of the technical aspects may well be sensitive militarily; we are not quite

Michelin, sub.

sure how the Panel would handle this type of information, or whether or not it would accept it all, this type of data.

Item five, on page 22, under infrastructure:

> "the number and types of personnel, distinguishing between military and civilian personnel, required to operate, service and maintain the base;",

we would like to see this extended a bit further. It should be required that the personnel identified is essential to the operations, service and maintenance be categorized in such a way that jobs currently being held by the military, or likely to be held by the military, but are capable of being done by civilians are identified, and as such giving civilian preference to the highest possible level and the greatest possible numbers.

We feel this would encourage people to commit themselves in their resources to increase their own training and advancing their education with some added assurance that these types of opportunities would exist when they finished up.

Item six, is essentially just a note on the comments of Mr. Bruce Moores of Environment Canada, who spoke to you last night showing some concern for fuel transport into Lake

Michelin, sub.

Melville and along the coast. We thought it was interesting to note that if we were successful in attracting the whole scope of the training that we envision, it would still amount to only about half of what we had here in the sixties, and such things as fuel, weaponry and supplies in larger quantities have been going through Labrador transportation lanes for the last 30 years.

In closing the written part of our statement, we would like to compliment the Panel on the diligence and the integrity that is shown in drafting the guidelines and assure them that the communities that turn out in the small contingents for the Draft Guideline hearings are not doing so out of a lack of interest or concern, but I think, rather, it reflects on the satisfaction that people have regarding the guidelines as they have gone through them.

Many of the interested groups will be out to the hearings when the proper time has come to present arguments or statements regarding the Environmental Impact study. We would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear here today and we anticipate meeting with you again.

This being the end of the written statement we do have a few comments we would like to make, apart from that, if you do not mind.

---SUBMISSION BY MS. CLARIS RUDKOWSKI:

Rudkowski, sub.

I am Claris Rudkowski. I am Chairperson of the Project Group. I must say that I was a little surprised to hear the presentation previous to ours. As we understood the proceedings today, we were to address the Draft Guidelines rather than taking full time brief, but however.

A couple of things I wanted to reiterate were a couple of things that Sue Feldsberg said this morning, and one them being the sewage problem, which is a concern to all of us. It is distressing, to say the least, that in this day and age we have raw, untreated sewage going into our waterways. It is problem now and certainly should be examined by the Panel in Part I of their study and not only in the event of a tactical training centre. I think that is terribly important.

The other thing, when we are talking about native and non-native, I think it is very important that you understand there is more than one or two native groups in Labrador. We have the Innu, or Indians; we have the Inuit, as some people like to call them, the Eskimo; we have the Metis; and we have also the white settler population, all of whom legitimately call themselves native.

For instance, I certainly consider myself a native Labradorian. The white part of my heritage dates back five generations and the indigenous people's part of my heritage dates back

Rudkowski, sub.

as long as the indigenous people have been here. So, I think I have a legitimate claim to being a native Labradorian.

So, I think in any discussions, or any studies that you might make, it is important that you define which native group that you are talking about.

Another point that Major McCabe mentioned this morning and that I had not heard of before was the possibility of an ocean, I think he called it, range. Although Major McCabe can give us certain assurances based on information available to him, I think we would like to be assured probably through studies of your Panel, that in the event there is such a range found to be necessary certainly we would need to look at the impact on the fishery on the coast. The fishery is the lifeline of the people in coastal areas, and we would want to know exactly how that would impact there.

Then again, we would be hoping to attract further oil exploration in the Labrador Sea. How would such a development affect that kind of a project? I think then, too, we have to look at how it will affect any possible shipping that might be going on in the coastal areas.

These are things that we would have to look at in the event that sort of a training area is needed.

Rudkowski, sub.

The last point, I think we have to remember that the airport here in Goose Bay is our primary resource and we feel very strongly that it cannot be sacrificed to a total military takeover. For instance, in our Makomi Project Group, I am going to reiterate again what Steve has just said: We came together here to promote development in the area but I want to say: Responsible development; that is, we do not want development at any cost.

So, when you consider responsible development, we have no problem with the military development, for instance, but we do not want it at the expense of other developmental possibilities. Therefore, the airport, being our primary resource, we would not like to see it go totally military and not have any commercial operations here. If that should happen, for instance, tourism would be stymied. We do not have a lot of tourism but we do have a lot of tourism potential, and if the airport operations were to be restricted to the commercial operators then that certainly would restrict that kind of development.

In that context, I think it is very essential that the airport be developed through consultation and co-ordination with the civilian population, and that is the end of my comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the end of your presentation I understand?

MR. MICHELIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have raised a number of questions in your presentation. Do you want the Panel to attempt to respond to these questions now?

MR. MICHELIN: If they would.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question of who is permitted to appear and at which locations, the procedures used in the meetings become particularly important when we anticipate large numbers of speakers. We attempted right from the beginning at the time we announced this series of meetings to plan a time schedule for each meeting to allocate time fairly. In the announcement we made it clear that anyone who wished to appear at any of these meetings and speak to the Panel should contact either our local Information Office in the case of Happy Valley-Goose Bay or the office in Ottawa, in advance, and register his or her intent to speak. That way we would know exactly who wanted to speak, how many we would have for each session of each meeting and allocate time fairly. We gave notice in there that if a large number of speakers were anticipated that we would, perhaps, have to limit each presentation to a maximum of 20 minutes.

In spite of all that effort to try and plan the meetings, we have had virtually no response at all to that invitation to pre-register from any location. So, when we came here we had a very small number of speakers indicated in advance.

For this afternoon,for example, we had only three on the list and that is only very recently that we have had that many. If we had six or eight speakers scheduled for this afternoon, I would have indicated a maximum limit for each speaker and I would certainly have stuck to that as far as possible.

With regard to persons coming in from outside the community, our priority always would be speakers from within the community where the meeting is being held. I think that is the only fair thing to do, given that we are going to a large number of places and speakers will have the main opportunity to speak in their own community. In this case, I did not feel inclined to be strict about that because, as I say, we had very few pre-registered speakers here and looking at what was ahead for this afternoon we could have had at least half an hour or perhaps close to an hour for each of the three speakers, if they wanted that much. I do not know if you want me to say anything else in response to that?

MR. MICHELIN: Only to point out that we are from this community and we have lost one of our people because of time constraints this afternoon. Mr. Strachen had to leave because of time constraints.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is regrettable.

MR. MICHELIN: We did pre-register. I called your Information Office last week and registered for two o'clock session this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if I had known that it was very important for you to go on first, then I could have re-arranged things. It is only that Mr. Michel was last up this morning and we did not have time to put him on then and so we put him on first thing this afternoon. I am sorry for the inconvenience and let us try to do better the next round of meetings.

With regard to the subject matter of the presentations, what you say is true in that the main purpose of these meetings is to hear comment on the Draft Guidelines document and we appreciate that you have done that and thank you very much. As I said on earlier occasions, this is the first time that the Panel has appeared in public and it is to be expected, I suppose, that some people for one reason or another may want to say other things to the Panel, and I do not believe that much would be accomplished by trying to stifle people when they want to talk about other things than comments on the guidelines. There may be some people who wish to speak who, for one reason or another, are not particularly well equipped to make critical comments on these guidelines, and that is all right too.

This is an information-gathering exercise. It is not a public hearing. We want to keep things as informal as possible and in the material presented by most of the speakers so far I think that we can find items which indirectly pertain to the content of the guidelines and from which we can infer that some modification of the guidelines is necessary to bring them more into line with the issues as the various speakers see them. I think that is probably all I would want to say on that at the moment.

With regard to the definition of "significant adverse environmental effects", on page 11 of the guidelines document, item four, which sets out some minimum requirements under the heading of "Methodological Considerations", we do say that the Environmental Impact Statement:

> "... should define how the significance of predicted changes in the valued ecosystem components will be determined.
>
> The terms used to describe the significance of project-induced changes in valued ecosystem components must be unambiguously defined. If they cannot be so defined, adequate reasons must be given, ...", et cetera, etcetera,

so I believe we have indicated in the guidelines that we do want the proponent to define such terms as significant adverse environmental effects and we will expect to see that in the impact statement.

Having said all that, it will be obvious that the definition that will appear in the impact statement will be one chosen by the proponent, which is to be expected, since the document is going to be written by the proponent and from the proponent's point of view, and this is the way the system is. Those who do not agree with the proponent's definition of such terms as significant will have an opportunity to come before the Panel at the appropriate time and take issue with the definition, or, for that matter, anything else in the Environmental Impact Statement, and that, of course, will be the purpose of the review of the impact statement and the purpose of the public hearings.

I should enter for the record, since it is not television, that a dog has just entered the meeting room and is causing some distraction. However, it seems to be a very friendly dog.

I note that some of the items in your presentation are not questions. They are statements and I presume that you would be satisfied if we agree that we will take those under consideration and deal with them.

You raise the point of definition of the term "native"; that was raised by somebody else this morning. We will note your concern about that item too and take it into consideration.

As to the question of whether or not

this would constitute a referendum, I do not believe that that has occurred to the Panel, and, certainly, I do not believe that that would be the intention here. I think that rather than dictate detailed methodology to the proponent, it is generally the intention of the Panel to indicate what the issues are and indicate general standards for the methodology and expect that the proponent, in conjunction with the expertise that it will probably hire to assist it in preparing the impact statement, will choose suitable methods to produce the desired results. We have expertise available to us, not only within the Panel, but in the staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Office, and in other departments of government ready to assist the proponent at any time in the design of appropriate methodology of studies. So, rest assured that the Panel will keep a close watch on the methodology that is chosen in each case.

Item four concerning the acceptance of information. As I have already noted, any information made available to the Panel in the course of this review has to be made public. That is a stated policy under the environmental assessment process and the simple answer to your question about sensitive information is, that if it could not be made public then it would not be accepted by the Panel. We would say, thank you very much and turn it back, and say, we cannot accept this information. So, the review has to be conducted and the impact statement written using only information which can be made public.

Perhaps you would assist me in identifying any other questions that you would like responses to. I am looking through your presentation here.

MR. MICHELIN: I think that is pretty well it.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I said, we will take the rest of the material, the comments and suggestions, you have made; all of which seem to be quite reasonable and give them due consideration in the course of refining the guidelines.

Would any member of the Panel care to ask a question for clarification from either of our speakers? Would any member of the audience care to ask a question? Do you have any final remarks that you would care to make?

MS. CLARIS RUDKOWSKI: Just, thank you gentlemen; we appreciate your time and the chance to speak to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are quite welcome.

MR. STEVE MICHELIN: Thank you as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that Lieutenant-Colonel David, the Base Commander, would like to have something to say. If you are ready, sir, would you like to come forward now and do so.

---SUBMISSION BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL JOHN DAVID:

Panel, ladies and gentlemen: I have been sitting in listening to some of the concerns put forward and I would like to, perhaps, clarify a couple of things that have been said for the benefit of the Panel and also to ensure there is not a misunderstanding on certain operations that are ongoing now based on some of the information and questions put forward this morning, so that you have that information available to proceed and also the public.

But, first, the many questions that have been posed today the majority of them there are answers available already, and as you go on with your meetings there will be many more questions, and I hope that in the information process there is a vehicle so that these questions the answers can be available in the immediate future; not at the end of the process so they can be dealt with.

The other thing I would like to see in the process: If at any time there is a very adverse impact identified by whoever that is involved in this study, that certainly it be made available immediately to those who can do something to make it better; to ensure that it does not go on. I do not know if that is in place in the system or not but I would recommend that, perhaps, if possible, that that be put in place.

David, sub.

It is very clear that there is some large misunderstanding in how the flying is done and how it is conducted currently under the bilateral agreements, and I would like to make it clear the flying that is ongoing now is primarily a step-down program where more than 60 per cent of all the flying; perhaps even higher than that, is done at altitudes greater than 250 feet and as high as 800-1,000 feet. The 100-foot flying is constrained to those areas that you see on the map here.

There is and there has been supersonic flights conducted in Labrador and in these areas, not only in the past year but over the past 20 years. In fact, with the prime task of the air defence of North America with the fighters that were here in the sixties, that was their mission. They were involved in supersonic air combat training here on a daily basis and there are many people in this room who experienced sonic booms from that.

It is something that is not new and, in fact, in the major exercises that we are involved with here, the Amalgam Brave, which has been ongoing for 15 years, a fair percentage of that involves supersonic intercepts.

To clarify what that means and how that is done, normally it is an aircraft takes off

David, sub.

and goes out and intercepts an aircraft, either at high level or incoming at low level one of the aircraft at 250 feet and it may be in a descent intercepting that to below 5,000 feet and it may go through the sound barrier in that intercept.

We have very little opportunity now and even in the foreseeable future with the training program to have supersonic straight and level low flying for a number of reasons. The main being, the efficiency of the mission. There is nothing to be gained and there is very little opportunity for that to be done. It would be an inadvertent thing where an aircraft is trying to run away from an interceptor and it would be for a very short period.

There was a question brought up on focus booms, supersonic booms. That occurs, primarily, if an aircraft is in a vertical descent and goes through the sound barrier. The sonic wave travels in the direction of the airplane, so if it was coming straight down the sonic boom would be a greater noise than if it were in a climb going away. That was not made clear this morning in questions and I just wanted to clarify that.

Another thing I want to point out is, that 95 per cent of all the low flying here is done at speeds between 300 and 480 knots, and five per cent or less is done at speeds greater than that; very, very short periods of time.

David, sub.

One last point, to keep the numbers of people in perspective that we were talking about. In the past,with the military operation that was here,we were involved to a maximum, primarily with the United States Air Force people, of up to 12,000 military and civilians, of which up to 7,000 were pure military personnel. We are currently,with our operation today,about 900 military and at the end of the program this fall we will be back to about 400 permanently over the winter.

The point I am trying to make now is that it was left out of the discussions earlier, that the maximum numbers of military and civilians envisioned with the bilateral and if you had full scale NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre here, military and civilians, we would be looking at 7,000. I think that that should be available to the people so they understand the size of past, current, and envisioned full scale future operations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Colonel David. I wonder if you would mind staying where you are for the moment in case somebody might like to have something clarified. Would anybody on the Panel care to ask Colonel David a question about what he has just said? Doctor Wilkinson.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Sir, I did not

quite follow your explanation about the focus sonic boom. You said it happens when the plane is going down vertically; is that correct?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID: Yes, a focus boom is when you have people or something on the ground; the sonic boom travels in the direction of the aircraft. So, if you are travelling level or pointed up, the impact of a sonic boom is going to be less than if you were pointing directly at the object that is receiving the noise. A person on the ground, to receive that focus boom, would receive a greater boom if it is directed directly at them. Now, if he is below the level of the individual and directing at him then he is going to get a focus boom from that.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Okay, I understand; thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from the Panel? Would anybody in the audience like to put a question to Colonel David?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID: I would provide one other bit of information just for information purposes. I have had calls over the past year from the area of Makkovik about sonic booms, and it is not military aircraft. In fact, it has been the Concord en route to New York City in a descent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Colonel David.

Now, we have more than half an hour left in our scheduled afternoon session. I would repeat what I said earlier about encouraging anyone who would like to come forward. Yes, sir, please?

ARCHDEACON FRANCIS BUCKLE: I think we were on for 4:00 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, no one passed your name to me. Anyway no harm. Would 35-40 minutes be enough for your presentation?

ARCHDEACON BUCKLE: That would be fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, then go right ahead please, if you would not mind identifying yourself for the record.

---SUBMISSION BY ARCHDEACON FRANCIS BUCKLE:

I am Archdeacon Buckle, and I am the Chairman of the Happy Valley and District Ministerial.

I wanted to begin by saying that we are overwhelmed by the complexity, the cost, and possible long term implications for Labrador and the world of the establishment of a Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre in Labrador. The proposed Project has so many unknowns and we feel rather inadequate to speak to the guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Study.

We would, however, make the following comments:

Buckle, sub.

1. That we are pleased that the Draft Guidelines make it possible to discuss the issues related to land claims, even though Land Claims policy does not fall within the scope of the review. That being so, we would also ask that the guidelines make provision for discussion of peace issues, if not Canada's defence policy, and a part the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre might play in the escalation or, I suppose, de-escalation of the arms race and how it fits into the whole question of world peace.

2. Under Section 3.1, we would ask that early in the EIS study the proponent be asked to provide the studies which, presumably, took place prior to the setting up of the present tactical fighting areas and to make public the nature and extent of the review which allowed the present low level flying activity under the bilateral agreements.

3. Presumably the impact of the proposed Project on the social fabric of the community and the mental health of the population will be considered during the study. We are aware that the ecosystem approach is being used and we commend it. The social impact of such a development deserves the closest attention possible. Our experience in the past in this community has been that when development is taking place, that the social cost has been enormous.

Buckle, sub.

As to the impact the Project might have on the mental health of the population there would,   feel, be some anxiety on the part of people living near a storage site for explosives and/or conventional weapons.

There would also be the feeling that the area may be the target for the enemy whoever the enemy may be, and the increased flying activity with accompanying increased noise levels would have, we think, a similar effect on the mental health of people. It is an area, again, which calls for the most careful study.

4. We would ask why the terms of reference for the bilateral agreements and the establishment of the Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre are different. In the case of the farmer, the EIS is being asked to assist the proponent in designing the activities further to minimize any adverse effects, but in the case of the latter, the establishment of TFWTC, it has power to recommend whether or not the Project proceeds.

We would add as a footnote that this would be the first opportunity for the public to have any impact into low level flying activities in Labrador, even though these activities have been going on for some years and continue to escalate.

Buckle, sub.

5. The timeframe for the EIS does not, we feel, permit the kind of in-depth studies required. We fear that the environmental studies which are or will be undertaken will be inadequate and somewhat superficial. We would urge that independent studies on a wide variety of environmental issues be made to ensure their objectivity.

We are aware that the Department of the Environment, Inland Water Directorate, feels, and this is a quote from one of their people that:

> "The potential impact on small game, songbirds, fur bearing animals, porcupine and other species, are not known but are of little concern."

So, we feel that we have good reason for expressing concern that government-sponsored studies will do a whitewash job.

We make this statement in the light of comments made by provincial and federal government officials, particularly comments made by these officials at scoping workshops held on June 9 and 10 and June 18, 1986 at St. John's and at Halifax.

We refer again, finally, to the magnitude of the Project. It is difficult for the average layman to comprehend all that is envisaged to take place, a quarter of Labrador's airspace being used almost exclusively for military

Buckle, sub.

purposes; at least one air combat manoeuver range; overland tactical air-to-surface range; and a possible sea range; and air-to-air range.

The study deserves the best minds and the closest attention possible to detail. We ask not that the review process be completed expeditiously, as DND has requested, but that it be carried out with the greatest care possible using the most thorough and rigourous studies that are available.

These are our comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Archdeacon Buckle. I think what I would like to do is take the same sort of approach as I did with the previous presentation and that is, attempt to provide answers now to what appear to be questions in your presentation and to take the rest of the presentation under advisement to be considered later.

With regard to provision for discussion of peace issues, you have recommended the inclusion in the guidelines. I do not believe that that appears in the guidelines at the present time. It would seem possible to do that without stepping beyond our mandate and certainly we will consider it, and we will discuss this in November when we meet privately.

Doctor Wilkinson would like to ask a

question on this particular point.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I just wondered if, to facilitate our further internal deliberations on this, you could perhaps give us a little more detail or guidance as to what you mean by peace issues, the kinds of things that you would like us, perhaps, to consider and to add to our guidelines.

ARCHDEACON BUCKLE: I think the questions we have tried to wrestle with in the Committee of the Ministerial is, how will this Project in any way enhance the peace of the world, or, our concern would be that what indeed might happen is that it might escalate. There is an honest fear in my heart and in the hearts of many people as to where our world is headed.

I mean it would be irresponsible on my part or perhaps on many people's part to say otherwise, and I am scared of where our world is headed. We think that this kind of Project might very well de-stablize the present relationship that is there, and we wondered how -- we need, I think, for someone to address how this, in fact, would help towards world peace, and, in fact, if this is the way around it? Are we doing the wrong thing and how whether or not this is just the wrong approach to take to the whole question of peace.

So,these are the kind of issues which we thought were precluded under your guidelines, that we would like to have dealt with, and there are others.

My thought was, that you would say that it cannot be considered, so you got me off guard a bit, but thank you.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: But, since in this document we are trying to tell the proponent what to do in his study, can you suggest any way in which the proponent could perhaps try to provide an answer to this question. In your opinion, is it a political question and can one find data to support the view that it will enhance peace or support the view that it will, in fact, have the opposite effect, or is it, do you think, a kind of moral judgment. In other words, is it something that is capable of study, analysis, and reporting.

ARCHDEACON BUCKLE: Obviously, there are moral issues here related to all this. That kind of expenditure, for example, has to be -- and that is related to world peace as well and de-stablization. I am not sure what the total cost is we are talking of here, but it is an enormous amount of money, whether that is considered to be built here or in Turkey, and we would want that to be looked at in terms of a contribution to either the de-stablization or the peace of the world or whatever.

I am not sure -- there are various

aspects of this that our group would have to look at again very seriously, but the two or three that I have mentioned we would ask, if there was an opportunity, we would want to do some further work on.

THE CHAIRMAN: In item four of your presentation you ask a question about the terms of reference and why they are different for the two different components of the proposal.

Not to take the easy way out of this but, as I have indicated before, the terms of reference are given to the Panel by the Minister. They are normally developed between the Minister of Environment and the Minister of the initiating department which in this case is the Department of National Defence, and the Panel has no opportunity to have input to those terms of reference because they are usually formulated before the time of the appointment of the Panel in fact.

I guess the rationale behind this is that the existing exercises have been going on and are going on under international agreements and those agreements extend over a certain period of time and that it has been assumed that they are to continue throughout that period. Beyond that I am really at a loss to offer any further explanation.

Would anyone on the Panel care to add anything to that comment?

In your item five, you express some concern about the adequacy of a study that will be undertaken. We acknowledge that the timeframe that has been suggested for our review is, in the eyes of some people, rather short. I would say that it is clear to us that no everyone agrees with the opinion that potential impacts on the groups that you have mentioned are of little concern, and for that reason we have attempted to provide in the guidelines for investigation and discussion of those very subjects. We have consulted with a great many people in preparing this draft and we hope that even with the relatively short timeframe for the preparation of the impact statement, that through the use of a great deal of information which is already existing and which has never been published but which exists in various files here and there as a result of studies done in the past, that the use of that and using studies which can be completed within our timeframe the proponent can prepare a satisfactory impact statement which will address the concerns.

Do you agree that that addresses the actual questions you have raised here and are you satisfied for us to take the rest under advisement?

ARCHDEACON BUCKLE: Thank you for responding in that way. My thought is that there has not been a great deal of study. Labrador has been studied to death in some respects but I am not sure that it is wildlife that has been studied. When you can get someone from the Department of Environment saying that the impact on this and small game and songbirds and fur bearing animals and porcupines and other species are not known, it implies that there are no baseline studies from which to start. So, it would seem to me that what you are going to be doing is almost starting from scratch in that area, and I do not know how, within the period that the EIS allows, you can do studies which will have any great significance. I guess that is one of the things I am saying.

The other thing I think we wanted to say is, that we would have, I guess, a greater confidence of studies that were done by groups that do not have a vested interest, presumably -- or, do not presumably have a vested interest, because certainly the indication that the public has is that the federal and provincial governments are anxious that this Project proceed, and whether or not all the departments that fall under the auspices of each government or kind of take that stand I think is a question maybe that I would be interested to know how you would respond to that.

I mean the official government policy, both federal and provincial, our understandin is are anxious that this Project proceed. If you have not heard John Crosbie, I could tell you about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, certainly, we cannot deny that we have heard from both governments statements that would indicate their support for the Project, certainly.

I guess I would say that I hope that time will lessen your concern about the adequacy of this review. We are obliged to work within our terms of reference. The timeframe that I have suggested is just that: A suggested timeframe at the present time. We have been given to understand that there is some flexibility here; that subject to certain constraints we could discuss possible changes in that timeframe, but just how much flexibility has not become apparent and may only become apparent with time. Beyond that I would say that we just hope that this review can be conducted within that timeframe, and assure you that the Panel is going to make every effort to produce the best review that it can under the circumstances.

ARCHDEACON BUCKLE: Yes, I would simply add from my past experience with you, that you certainly would see to that and our hope would be that other members of the Panel would similarly do likewise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. One more

opportunity for any member of the Panel to ask for any clarification or amplification of what Archdeacon Buckle has said. Would any member of the audience care to put a question to Archdeacon Buckle? Yes, Colonel David; go ahead, please.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID: I would like to clarify one comment that the areas in use are not exclusively for military. The airspace is used by all people at all times. We fly in them to tell people that that is where we will be doing that flying.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it a fair comment, sir, to say, though, that in those areas that the military fly it would have some degree of priority?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID: No, no priority at any time today. In fact, those areas are specifically to identify where pilots can fly to 100 feet only. They can fly anywhere north of 50 degrees outside of populated areas, et cetera, to 250 feet, or they can fly on the air routes the same as everybody else and we must abide by the same regulations for instrument flying as all other aviators in Canada and there is full use of that area on a daily basis by all users. In fact, we have weekly meetings with all users to deconflict the airspace and to advise them where we are flying.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colonel David. Any other question from the audience?

MR. MICHEL: Just a point of clarification as to what the Colonel was saying and an observation that I think he ought to realize. Just some years ago I think most people in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area must be aware of an aircraft that crashed in what is known as Rabbit Island just southeast of the Happy Valley-Goosebay area on the Lake Melville area where, I think, the pilot went too close to the water and really crashed into the water without him realizing how close he was to the water. That is not an area that is consigned as a 100-foot zone area. So, I think it is for public record that that should be indicated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Michel. Would anyone else in the audience like to say something at this point, particularly a question to Archdeacon Buckle? Yes, sir.

(UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER): Yes, I am a member of the Happy Valley Ministerial as well, and I was not quite clear on your response to Reverend Buckle in terms of the terms of reference being given that you must accept as they are. I am just wondering, are we saying that cannot be an issue then why there is a distinction between the bilateral agreements and the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Centre. Are you saying that we are not able to add that as an issue to the guidelines?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that the Panel will be able to add that as an issue, no. If you wish to pursue the matter and ask somebody why the difference, I am afraid that as the Chairman of the Panel I would have to pass the buck and direct you to the office of the Minister of Environment.

Thank you, Archdeacon Buckle, for your presentation.

We still have a little time left and I am perfectly willing to listen to anyone else out there in the audience who feels that he or she would like to have something to say. I only ask that you use one of the floor microphones and identify yourself clearly before you begin to speak.

If not then, I imagine the time has come to adjourn this session of the meeting. There will be a final session here tonight in this same location starting at 7:00 o'clock. Thank you very much.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4:50 P.M. to be resumed at 7:00 P.M., October 2nd, 1986.

---Upon resuming at 7:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before we actually begin the meeting just another reminder that smoking is prohibited anywhere inside this building, both in here in the hall and in the corridor outside, and we will be having a smoking break a little later on.

I was wondering how many people are here tonight who have not been at any previous session? Could we have a show of hands? Two persons. I am trying to determine whether I should go through the detailed introductory presentation or an abbreviated version. I see a shaking head, fine. We will do the short version as we did this afternoon.

First, I would like to correct the record from earlier today. At one point I indicated that the Panel had added another meeting location at the end of its series this week and that it was going to be in L'Anse au Clair on Saturday night. The location of the meeting will actually be Forteau. The specifics about the exact location and time and everything will be published but it will be in the community of Forteau.

For those of you who do not already know it, my name is David Barnes and I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, that has been appointed to conduct a public environmental review of certain proposed military flying activities over areas of Labrador and Quebec.

I would like to introduce the other members of the Panel so that you can get to know them a little better. At the end of the table to your left, adjacent to the window, Mr. Tom Northcott, a biologist, with extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador; Vice-President of his own consulting firm in St. John's and previously a research biologist with the Wildlife Division of the provincial government.

Next to him, Mr. Don Stewart, a retired Brigadier General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of a NORAD region and was stationed for a time here in Goose Bay.

Next to him, Mr. Tim McNeill, who operates a small business in his home town of Makkovik, and who is quite knowledgeable about the concerns about the Inuit people of Labrador.

On my left, Mrs. Beatrice Watts, Director of the Native Curriculum Centre, former Mayor of Northwest River, and she has also been involved in the National Status of Women Council and Labrador Legal Services.

To her left, Mr. William Jourdain, a Montagnais Indian from Sept-Iles. He has been active in Band affairs and commercial enterprises in Sept-Iles and was employed for 20 years with the Iron Ore Company of Canada before his retirement.

To his left, Doctor Paul Wilkinson, a biologist, who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec and who operates a consulting firm in Montreal.

I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office and I have been for the past year or so where I am Director for the Atlantic Region, prior to which I was employed for about 11 years with the provincial government of Newfoundland in the Environment Department.

The Panel is supported by a three-member Secretariat. I am not sure if any or all of them are in the room at the present time. Yes, I do believe they are. The Executive Secretary of the Panel is Mr. Carrol Martin. Would you identify yourself, please? The other two members of the Secretariat being Mr. Michel Bourgon at the back and Mr. Jim Clark.

As I said earlier, I have introduced these people because they are the people to whom you should direct any requests for additional information about this review in particular, or the environmental assessment process in general. There are a great many publications available if you want to delve deeply into all the details.

The lady seated at the table in front

and to the side here is Mrs. Munro, who is our Reporter for this session. She is taking down everything that is said here, so be careful. I mention this because we will have transcripts, official transcripts, of all of our meetings prepared and as soon as they have been delivered to us they will be available, on request, to anyone who wants to read them.

Now, just briefly, I will give you an outline of this review that we are directing. A brief word of background, the review is going on because it is called for under the Environmental Assessment Review Process, which was established by the Government of Canada in 1974, for purpose of increasing the level of public consultation in decisions of the federal government on approval of major resource development projects, resource use projects, for which the Government of Canada is responsible in some way.

This particular review was initiated in February of this year when the Department of National Defence, which is the proponent in this case, wrote to the Minister of Environment and described the Project and asked him to appoint a Panel to conduct a review.

The Panel was appointed by the Minister in July and was given its terms of reference and that document has been distributed along with a great many other bits of information about this review. As a result of a review of the literature and the records of a series of preliminary meetings held by staff of the office with various interested parties, the Panel drew up a list of what it regarded at the time; this was in August of this year, as the emerging issues in this review and used them as the basis for a document which we called Draft Guidelines, which was issued in August. The document intended, eventually, to be the instructions which the Panel will give to the proponent to guide it in the preparation of its Environmental Impact Statement, which will be one of the central documents of the review.

That document was put out in draft form for comment from any interested party so that the Panel can be sure that when it gives the final form of the guidelines to the proponent it will be as good a document as it can possibly be.

We are now in the midst of a series of public meetings in what is now, I guess, 17 locations in total in Quebec and Labrador, as well as Montreal and St. John's. The main purpose of these meetings being to solicit comment from anyone who wishes to make comment on the content of those Draft Guidelines.

When our meetings are over at the end of October the Panel will meet privately during November and will review all of the informatio incoming from these meetings and will then refine the document into the final form of the guidelines, which it will present to the proponent in December of this year.

During the period then from December, 1986 through to the late spring or early summer, perhaps, of 1987, the Department of National Defence will prepare its Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Panel. When that document is delivered to the Panel, it will immediately become available to the public so that the public, the Panel, the government, any interested party, will have a period of several months to study the impact statement, probably during the summer and early fall of 1987.

When the Panel is satisfied that the impact statement is satisfactory, that is, if it conforms to the requirements laid out in the guidelines, it will announce the holding of public hearings to discuss the Project. The most likely time for those hearings being the fall of 1987.

The final stage of the review will be the preparation of a report by the Panel in which it will discuss the Project, the expected impacts of the Project, and possible remedies for adverse impacts and means of enhancing beneficial impacts on the Project. It will also make recommendations to the Government of Canada concerning the two components of the Project, which are on the one hand the ongoing low level flight training activities, which have been ongoing for several years, and, on the other hand the proposal to establish a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre at Goose Bay.

The Panel's report is expected to be ready to submit to the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence sometime late in 1987 or early 1988.

Now, it has become the established practice of all Panels conducting reviews that whenever it goes out to hold a public meeting it invites along a representative of the proponent for the purpose of providing information to the public and the Panel on the nature of the Project itself and also to be ready to answer questions from both the Panel and the public, for elaboration on the nature of the Project.

At this time I would like to introduce Major David McCabe, and without any further adieu I will ask Major McCabe -- no, sorry, I will not; that is the long presentation. We are going to dispense with the presentation on the Project, but he is still, nevertheless, available for questions probably later this evening after we have heard from our scheduled speakers.

Before we go on, does anyone have any questions on the review, the process I have just described? Fine.

The first scheduled presentation for this evening is to be from the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay. I see a shaking head at the back indicating that nobody representing the Town has arrived yet. In that case we will move to our second scheduled speaker, who is Mr. Peter Bradford. Mr. Bradford, would you like to come up to the front table.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. PETER BRADFORD:

It is during the last couple of years of military activity in Goose Bay there have been incidents on or very near the airport involving aircraft. Specifically, I would like to point out to you two such incidents. First, Royal Air Force Jaguars in close formation touch wings, resulting in the air crews ejecting and the aircraft crashing locally around the airport. The second concerns the abandonment of a Royal Air Force Tornado aircraft after the pilot had recovered to the airport and attempted to land. The crew ejected when the aircraft touched the runway, which was runway 08, and after the crew ejected this aircraft continued to fly, and I put fly in quotes, travelling approximately one and a half miles down the runway, pitching up, and, fortunately, veering to the left of runway 08. I say, fortunately, because if that particular aircraft had veered right or had travelled further some property damage

Bradford, sub.

and loss of life probably would have occurred.

I would like to ask the Panel if a safe designated ejection site to cater to recovering aircraft that are in trouble has been or will be established within close proximity of the airport. And, I would like to know what procedures are in force or will be put into effect when aircraft using runway 08 experience a failure of some kind, particularly after take-off, necessitating ejection by the crew, that this aircraft will not impact into the Spruce Park, MOT, or the Valley housing areas.

Also, I would like to ask if financial compensation may be agreed to by the NATO countries, if, in fact, one of their aircraft impacts into Spruce Park or other residential areas destroying property and causing loss of life and what this amount might possibly be?

No one knows for sure where an abandoned aircraft will crash but procedures should be established to minimize the risk of these abandoned aircraft from crashing into built-up residential areas, the fuel storage sites, and from causing potentially extensive forest fires, et cetera.

Leaving that, I would also like to ask the Panel if there would be any consideration given to appointing a civilian liaison officer, one person to whom all local inquiries or complaints could be made and this person then would notify the appropriate department, get the required information, and give back the appropriate response.

I myself have had difficulty trying to reach people about some of my concerns and I have been to various agencies in Town Council, Town Councillors, and General David, and that is all I have, sir, this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bradford. I think I am fairly safe in saying that at the present moment the Panel would have very little information to respond to any of those questions. They sound like the sort of questions that Major McCabe might be able to try to respond to. Would you care to, Major?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I can attempt to respond to some of the concerns, sir.

With reference to the establishment of an ejection area, or safe ejection area, that is a normal part of station operating procedures or standard operating procedures at any military airbase that involves military flying be there ejection-equipped aircraft based there or not, on the possibility that that type of aircraft might come into the airfield. Normally, that is the procedure.

I must confess I do not know what the local procedures that are established currently in

Goose Bay. They may well, indeed, have such an area. I know when I myself was posted here as an Air Traffic Controller such an area did exist. . I would assume it still does. I think to complete that I am quite sure with the increase, if you like, of activity there would be certainly increased attention focused on the availability of such an area. As I say, I would be surprised if there was not one in existence at this time.

As far as procedures for departure off 08, for example, I really cannot offer much of a response to that. I think it is an inherent risk, if you like, at any kind of airport, be it civilian or military. The possibility always exists, however remote, that there may be some form of an accident and we read about those from time to time around the world. Normally, the whole air traffic control procedures at an airfield will govern or will cover safe departure, safe arrivals, et cetera, and take into account the normal kinds of things of noise abatement, et cetera.

Emergency situations are very difficult to cover all aspects of that and I really have not much to offer other than, I suppose, I could suggest there have been -- particularly from the point of view of aircraft that do have an option of ejection, and I am sure Mr. Bradford knows from his own flying experience -- cases where air crew have, indeed, seen a situation where possibly a life-threatening situation was developing with their aircraft and have, indeed, sacrificed themselves to ensure that that was avoided. I am not suggesting that that is policy by any means. It is something we really cannot govern.

As far as compensation and things that Mr. Bradford asked about, I am not in a position to really comment on that. I know that in the agreements that exist right now there are some writings in there, if you like, some statements, which govern things like responsibility for forest fires and things like that that might be created by crashes or weapons, and I cannot go into any details because I am not familiar enough with it, but, they have been considered. Such a disaster, Heaven forbid, as actually crashing into an occupied area, built-up area, is really something I could not answer, I do not know.

MR. STEWART: Perhaps I could just add a word, Panel. In discussing the make-up of the sections of the guidelines, we were certainly conscious of the flight safety problems. I guess we were focusing more on the increased activity that would develop around here, and in trying to provide some guidance to the Department of Defence for the preparation of the impact statement we did say in there, and whether we have the right words or not, in that section dealing with the weapons centre that we wanted to see a risk analysis for the various types of accidents, including non-flying accidents that could reasonably be foreseen and a description of the relevant emergency planning. I think that is really trying to put it in a package, in one sentence, that we want to see the organization of the base; we want to see such questions as the emergency plans for accidents on-base, off-base, and I think that that will all come forth in the preparation of the guidelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: In that connection, Mr. Bradford, I would ask you: Are you looking for immediate answers to those questions or would you be satisfied to wait to see the matters discussed in the impact statement?

MR. BRADFORD: I think that they should be maybe addressed in your guidelines and I hope to see when you do have your brief presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good, then we will take that into consideration. Thank you very much.

Would any other member of the Panel care to pose a question to Mr. Bradford for any clarification on any of the subjects that he has raised?

MRS. WATTS: Mr. Bradford, did I hear you ask the question or mention the fact that it is very difficult to find a contact when something like this happened?

MR. BRADFORD: No, not specifically into accidents, but I have, on occasion, brought up the problem of noise and noise abatement and this has been going on. A couple of years ago I wrote a letter to Colonel David through the Town Council and had a response directly from Colonel David on that occasion, and I have also talked to several councillors without much success on getting any answer at all as to who I could contact and who would be the best person to talk to on certain aspects of living close to the airport.

So, I have not been able to get any useful answers from varied people. All I am suggesting is that maybe if one person could be appointed then I could write a letter and so could Joe Blogs down the street; he could go to the same person, and, at least, someone would be there who you know and you could contact and you could leave it in their hands to look up the appropriate department and then you would be looking for your answer not directly from the department concerned but through this particular person who can give you an answer, a sort of ombudsman, if you like, of potential problems that may come up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would have thought that the military would have some sort of public relations or public information office that would, at least, serve as a contact. Is that not the situation?

MR. BRADFORD: It is not to my knowledge. I know that in flying we go to the RCC, but that is when they advise us of local flights and the routes that are being taken.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will take note of that. Yes, Mr. Stewart.

MR. STEWART: I think, in looking over that particular section of the guidelines, certainly to ask the question about noise abatement procedures would not be an unreasonable request to lay in the guidelines to DND, and we could discuss that one further.

I think the thing that needs to be highlighted also here is that this is a unique airport with the split of responsibility that exists between the air traffic control system and the management of the airfield, so it is not an easy airfield to get responses from people on specific questions because it is not a case of buck-passing, I do not think. It is a case of the way it is organized and, hopefully, some of that might be cleaned up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bradford.

I understand that the Mayor of Happy Valley-Goose Bay has now arrived so I would invite him to come forward whenever he is ready and sit at the table at the front.

---SUBMISSION BY MAYOR HENRY SHOUSE:

Good evening. Mr. Chairman, Panel Members. My name is Henry Shouse, Mayor of the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

I am here with many mixed emotions, some of which I will, perhaps, voice later, or, I may not.

The NATO possibilities have been very much the topic of conversation in Council meetings in the community itself for a good many months. By motion of the Council the Council unanimously approved the expansion of military activities in the area, the use of the runway which is in our community, and as spokesman for the people of Happy Valley-Goose Bay I dare say we are the ones who have the most to gain or the most to lose.

We have discussed this at many Council meetings. We have gone over your information here at great length and after spending probably three and a half hours discussing our approach tonight, or during this present hearing, we came up with basically a half page.

We are beginning to think since you started the hearings all over that perhaps we had misread the information and we went back to it, and we still came back with the same decision, that the only thing we were discussing was the

Shouse, sub.

different items that were to be discussed at a later meeting, and we are quite surprised that the Panel has not really followed their own guidelines.

We are also surprised that you are holding two other meetings outside of Labrador, that really are not involved in the local issue from our point of view; one in Montreal and one in St. John's. We see no purpose of either of those meetings and I may say something about that later.

Right for the time being I will go over our brief. From the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay. We wish to thank you for the opportunity to address the Panel concerned the the proposed Draft Guidelines reviewing the military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec.

The Council generally supports you with the issues that you state on page 13, item five. However, the Council has some concern as it relates to items 6.4.5., page 30, Socio-Economic and Resource Use Data. These concerns are civilian hire, local preference, job training, hours of operation and the air safety for civilian aircraft.

The Council wishes to confirm a request made to the provincial and federal governments, that a coordinating committee be made up consisting of federal, provincial and local people to inform all levels of the ongoing plans and activities to effectively plan infrastructure

Shouse, sub.

for the future, that is roads and grounds, water and sewer, sewer treatment, and other such municipal services. Respectively submitted, the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Now, there seems no point in discussing our interest in, let us say, civilian hire, job security, because that will be coming up at the regular panel hearing.

I would make one comment in regard to our last paragraph. When the U.S. Air Force pulled out in the mid-seventies, which could have almost been the death of the town, a committee was set up with four federal, four provincial, and four local with one Executive Manager. That was set up by the governments to stand for three years, which it did, to coordinate the down-phasing of all the activities of Goose Bay, because even though the occupant there, the U.S. Air Force, was not Canadian, was not part of our country, and really had not the same responsibility as our own government department, it was very important that they left in proper order and that we retain some aspect of our lifestyle.

We have made this request to the federal government and to the provincial government. We have had extremely favourable response from both of them. Previously, it was called the Goose Bay Project Group. I believe now they are thinking

Shouse, sub.

more in the terms of a coordinating committee, because we find on Council it is very difficult to get any great information. I do not know that any great information is available. We have had excellent co-operation from Colonel David, who I am sure is not free to talk about everything he is told and he knows; that would be expected, and inasmuch as this is not to be a solely Canadian activity anyway that many decisions have to be made by those in other countries. So, we simply are not sure that there is anything coming.

We support this but not with our eyes shut and with our ears closed, and give us what you have whatever it is approach. I am sure everyone expects if this goes ahead to be done in a very rational manner with the least disturbance to existing lifestyles both ours and the Innu or anyone else, but we have to keep in mind that we are in a free country and we would like to keep it that way.

My father fought in the great Civil War south of the border to free the slaves, to free the Blacks; my brothers fought in the First World War to make the world safe for democracy; I was in the last World War, and as much as I detest some of the protests I have heard about this I suppose there is some satisfaction in knowing that maybe my small efforts in the last war, along

Shouse, sub.

with millions of others, have helped kept at least our part of the world free, so people who do not agree have the right to come forward and disagree.

I certainly think, and I do not consider myself military oriented at all - I am quite the opposite; I am the type of person that thinks the first thing we should do in hockey is outlaw body checking and make it a decent game. However, when it comes to defending your own country that is a different story, a completely different story.

If the plans of NATO, and provided they are fully accepted by the Canadian government, include a low level training base in Labrador, then to us on Council it is our civic, Canadian responsibility to do what we can to help our country progress, grow, and stay free.

So, really, I do not think I will say more right now. We have a lot of concerns. The concerns to us can best be addressed with a new coordinating committee as I outline here. We are not so much interested in the military plans as to whether there is going to be 20 aircraft taking off a day or 40 or 100, but we are interested in whether our sewers are going to be overloaded, whether the water supply, which we do not control, is sufficient to also maintain our needs, and the housing, the hospitals, the schools; that is

Shouse, sub.

more our concerns rather than military oriented.

So, if you have any questions I would be glad to carry on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Mr. Shouse, in response to your presentation I would like to offer a few words of explanation. This process of issuing Draft Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement and inviting comments is something that has been done by virtually every Panel, I think, that has been appointed under this environmental assessment review process. Some Panels have done this by mail only, have mailed out the draft, and asked for written comments to be submitted. Others have done what we are doing; that is, have gone out and held meetings perhaps a month or two after the draft has been issued.

We felt that since the Panel was appointed in July that it was about time that we went out and showed our faces in public, and I think we are finding the same thing as have other Panels who have done this guidelines review exercise in public, that we are hearing a lot of other things in addition to comments on the guidelines. Now, that is not to say for a minute that those other presentations are of no value. On the contrary, we are listening carefully to everything that we are hearing and we have come to realize

Shouse, sub.

that there is a lot of information in those non-specific presentations that we can study; we can use them to infer that, perhaps, certain parts of the guidelines are not as good as they could be.

So, I think it is worthwhile that people have come forward and have spoken their minds even if they have not given technical, critical comments. item-by-item in the guidelines. I do not think anything has been lost with that process. We seem to have had enough time for everybody so far. I do not think anybody has been deprived of the opportunity to speak to the Panel.

I guess what I am leading up to is that now you are here seated at the table in front of us, you have the floor; you are welcome to it for any reasonable period of time this evening; please feel free to either elaborate. Perhaps, on paragraph two of your brief to us, if you would like to be a bit more specific about the items that you have enumerated there, or, also, perhaps, talk to us about the position of the town in this, the feelings of the town generally about the Project. I offer you the same opportunity as has been given to other groups who have spoken to us.

MAJOR SHOUSE: Thank you. The fact you have not been swamped by intervenors here, to me is a direct indication that the objection to this

Shouse, sub.

whole increase of activity is voiced by very few people indeed. Looking back and recalling the comments of a few minutes ago or half an hour ago, as I said earlier, we are not in favour of a great rush of activity, a great new flux of people at any cost, but we have to realize that there has to be a little give and take. Out of every good there might be a little bad.

Airport noise. Now, I have flown into a lot of airports in different parts of the world and often when I fly over I am looking down out the window and I see nothing but rows and rows, miles and miles of houses, and some of them get awfully close to the runway, and I think to myself what a noisey place that must be to me looking down at them -- well, I cannot touch them but very, very close -- and them on the ground looking up and here I am or here the airplanes are flying overhead. Anyone who moves to an airport town has to expect to hear airplanes. If I bought a house next to a railway, I could hardly complain if a train went by, and some houses are literally feet from railways, and if you live by a railway and by a crossing you might get a good blast of whistles all night long.

So, the fact that we have noise, we know we have noise, and that is why as a town we are developing new housing areas and we are

Shouse, sub.

specifically trying to stay away now from that possibility. We had quite an influx of housing lots. We did 67 this year, of which around 56 are resold and some of the houses have started going up now and some will be lived in this winter. People have confidence in the area. They have confidence in the town now that I have never seen before.

When I first came here, there was five log tar papered shacks in what is referred to as the Happy Valley portion. That was the civilian activity at the Goose airbase. Five little shacks, 1942. Since then, well, you have seen some of the town yourself I am sure since you have been here. Never in all those years has there been a feeling of security. When the U.S. Air Force was here for years and years it seemed like they were going to be here to forever, there was always that strong possibility any day they could go out, and, indeed, the day came. After that, when, by virtue of the Goose Bay Project Group, the two levels of government stepped in, took over the operation of the base, maintaining all of the infrastructure up there, that too was on a three-year life span. The three years have extended on considerable since then, but always with a very tricky position that we did not know what the future was, and, you know, surprising, we do not know what the future is now. We have

Shouse, sub.

no more reason to think it is any more secure.

There was an announcement on the radio within a day ago, that perhaps NATO will be disbanded. If the NATO base goes to another part of the world as a training facility, there is a feeling here we have good security to a degree with the bilateral agreements with the British and the Germans and now the Dutch. If the NATO base does not come, it definitely does not mean the end of low level flying. Low level flying means noise on the runway and I sympathize with those in Spruce Park. I have a son, who is one of the closest houses to the runway. They get far more noise than anyone in the country because anyone being overflown in the country you almost do not hear the plane until it is overheard or until it is past you and it is a very momentarily strong clash about like thunder. On the Spruce Park area or on the base area where you have aircraft at the end of the runway warming up; maybe they are waiting for take-off clearance, you have a more prolonged noise there than any place when they are flying.

But, the community, I am sure, strongly supports this and simply as proof we had our municipal elections last November; each of the nine winning councillors were strongly in favour in supporting the NATO bid for Goose Bay. If you

Shouse, sub.

could use the old expression "the people's choice", if there was strong feeling in the town against this very likely I would not be sitting here right now and it would have been someone else.

We have a lot of concerns which I am sure will be addressed later. When you come back Councillor Herbert Brett will be our spokesman. He is Chairman of our PIA Committee, Planning and Intergovernmental Affairs, and he will be talking on behalf of the town and at that time we expect to get in more detailed discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other thing occurred to me with regard to something that you said earlier, and that was the surprise that you expressed at the fact that we are holding meetings in Montreal and St. John's. I would like to explain why we are doing that.

We had a letter from a person speaking on behalf of, I believe, four or five groups that happen to be based in Montreal who state that they have broad concerns about the Project that go beyond what might be regarded as the region of impact of the Project, broad concerns about military activities generally, about effects of resource development on the environment in a general sense, and other matters, and requesting that because the Project is so large in its scope that it appears to them to have some significance at a national level, that we should hold a meeting of the Panel in Montreal as part of this series. We considered it very carefully and we decided that the request seemed reasonable and since we had already planned to visit 14 centres in Labrador and Quebec to add another location did not seem to be terribly inconvenient or much trouble for us.

Then, since we had decided to do that, that is hold a meeting outside of the "impact region" in a major city in the Province of Quebec, not the capital but still a major centre of government, we decided that it would be only fair to do the same in the Province of Newfoundland/ Labrador, and we chose the capital city, St. John's.

So, that is the logic for the use of those two locations for Panel meetings at this time.

MAYOR SHOUSE: To that I can only say, I am surprised you are not going to Toronto and Vancouver, which I look upon as the birthplace of protest groups. Surely, if Canada was going to partake in a NATO combined exercise in Turkey, would you be going to Montreal also because there was going to be a military build-up in Turkey?

I do not see that protesting here, nuclear war; who in the world wants nuclear war? No one. No one wants it any less than I do I am sure. I have seen what the plain old conventional bombs can do when you look at some of the German cities. It did not take a nuclear bomb to wipe out the cities over there. I do not want to see that happen again, and I think the saying, "peace through strength" has a tremendous amount of validity to it.

Also, personally, I would rather hear 1,000 jets in peacetime than one jet in wartime.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Shouse, we have received requests to hold meetings in major centres all across the country and we have stopped short of doing that, but I think it should be remembered that the Project is subject of considerable discussion in both provinces, Newfoundland/Labrador and Quebec, so, as I say, it does not seem unreasonable to us to hold meetings in major cities in those two provinces. It would take a lot more persuasion to convince us to go, for example, to Toronto or Vancouver or some other such place.

MAYOR SHOUSE: That is what I say, that is what I fought in the last war for. We just seem to have, we in North America, seem to have a way or a fascination about making life complicated. I think maybe the Indians have the right idea: Off in the country and in a camp and the world be damned. However --

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shouse. Now, I have not been advised of anyon else who wishes to speak this evening but we have considerable time left in our scheduled session. I throw the meeting open now and give out the invitation to anyone who would like to speak to come forward and sit at the table.

MS. CLARIS RUDKOWSKI: I just have one question, if I may?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly; use any of the microphones.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: I would like to know who made representation to you from St. John's and Montreal?

THE CHAIRMAN: No one in St. John's asked us to go there to hold a meeting. We made that decision ourselves in fairness to the Province of Newfoundland/Labrador to keep things as equally balanced as we could.

As for the Montreal request, I do not have with me right now a copy of the letter that requested that meeting. Would any of the members of the Secretariat happen to have a copy of that letter with them?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I believe that two of the groups in Quebec - one is the Quebec Wildlife Federation and I believe a second one is the Quebec Association of Biologists. The other three, I am not sure.

DOCTOR NORTHCOTT: I think also, if I can remember, there was a request from a number of outfitters that were headquartered in Montreal. Outfitters that have hunting camps near the Quebec/Labrador border.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, would you like to come forward, please?

MRS. SUSAN FELDSBERG: In the same context, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the remark that whilst I personally recognize the logic of providing a hearing in Montreal to satisfy those requests, when we in this area approached the Parliamentary Joint Committee on International Relations, who were holding hearings across the country from Vancouver to St. John's, in which discussions on NATO development would be part of that international relations exercise, and we felt that there was a very major NATO debate right here in this community which, perhaps, a joint committee of Senate and the House of Commons should hear and we should have the opportunity to contribute to, we had no such response.

I recognize the sensitivity of your Panel to have done better in this respect but I think you must understand the utter frustration that communities such as ours, and I think something that Mayor Shouse was perhaps trying to convey today, in not being able to contribute to a national debate, and yet that Joint Committee went in particular to St. John's, held a two-day hearing, received 12 group briefs and six individual briefs, all of which were extremely critical and negative of Canada's NATO involvement, much of which included critical comment on Goose Bay development, all perfectly legitimate in a democratic society, but all made 500 miles away from us, 500 miles away from this community, 500 miles away from this region, demonstrating much ignorance of the detail of the particular socio-economics and the politics of this particular district. We did not have the opportunity to contribute to a national debate which you are generously giving to the people of Montreal and St. John's. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else like to say something? We are perfectly prepared to stay here until 10:00 o'clock this evening.

MS. JOY PYE-McSWAIN: Yes, I am Joy Pye-McSwain, and I would like to thank the Panel for taking a second opportunity to listen to me; hopefully I will get this right. It was brought to my attention this evening by one of our Council members, that we have had a long standing concern with one particular environmental problem in this area.

I believe it would fall under in the guidelines, the cumulative effects of the Project and of other projects and activities in the region. I am sure the Panel is probably aware of the new North Warning Radar System that is being set up along the coast of Labrador. In conjunction with that the old DEW line stations are being dismantled. The PCBs, which are very commonly found at these stations, are being transported and stored locally.

I wonder if it would be possible that the Panel might suggest to the proponent to address what the final disposition of these PCBs will be. Are they going to remain stored here indefinitely, or how are they going to be disposed of?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you view this as part of this review? In other words, do you want to see this dealt with in the Environmental Impact Statement, or do you want quick answers.

MS. PYE-McSWAIN: I do not think there are any quick answers to the PCB problem. I would like to see it addressed in the review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will consider that. Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to come and speak to us? That leaves us wondering if we scheduled too much time here in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Yes, sir, come forward and identify yourself, would you please, before you speak, for the record.

MR. BOB BARTELL: My name is Bob Bartell; I represent the Mennonite Central Committee here in Happy Valley. I have been very reluctant to say anything, although I have concerns with regard to low level flying, because I have only been here one month. But, perhaps, because our organization has been here in Labrador for around 30 years, then perhaps I have some reason to speak.

I wanted to speak on several issues with regard to the Draft Guidelines and on page 13, number (5) (b) they talk about exhaust emissions and I would like to know if that includes spent fuel. I have only been here a month but I have heard several complaints about spent fuel, and I was wondering if that would affect, let us say, spawning areas of fish and what kind of health effects, let us say, on Spruce Park and so on, and I was wondering if we could include that exhaust emissions and spent fuel similarly. There are also references on page 20 and page 24 on exhaust emissions and I was wondering if you could include those as well.

On page 22, our organization is very concerned about unemployment in Canada as well as elsewhere, and I was wondering if it would be possible to do the following as regards to page 22, the infrastructure, and wherever we talk about the number and types of personnel at the bottom of the page:

> "... distinguishing between military and civilian personnel, required to operate, service and maintain the base;".

I would like to see the civilian personnel broken down further between Labradorian and outsiders.

Suppose there was 1,000 jobs provided by this base and if they were all taken up by outsiders, then there would be no -- the jobless position would not have changed even though the percentages of unemployment would have changed. So, I would like to see some kind of survey done on the skills of those presently unemployed here in Labrador and the possibilities of those people obtaining employment on the base.

I have two concerns about the timeframe. We are meeting here in October; that means the fall season is lost for any studies. You will be reconvening and meeting in the summer, early fall, and again the fall season is lost, and this is important particularly with regards to migratory birds - birds like the Greater Snow Goose, Canada Geese, and I speak to that -- my concern about that is largely because I have been here long enough to understand that hunting and fishing represents to many of the unemployed a substantial amount of food for them and it makes living on social assistance and unemployment insurance bearable because of the amount of food that they are able to get.

The second concern I have about the timeframe is the link between the low level flying and the tie to the NATO base. Now, I can understand why there is a hurry about the NATO base, but I have difficulty understanding why we must have the same hurry with the same studies for low level flying. Low level flying has been here since 1980 and is expected to go on for years to come. Why does the same kind of hurry have to be done with regards to low level flying?

There is no time for any kind of independent studies with this kind of timeframe.

Then I have one final concern and that applies to page seven, and it has to do with the phrase:

> "The Panel has been asked to assist the Proponent 'in designing these activities further to minimize any adverse impact';".

I think what is also very important to do is to establish a maximum, acceptable, minimum effect. I mean, what are we willing to put up with? And, I believe, it is the proponent's duty to establish standards throughout section five and section six. For example, you can look at number one: What are the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife? And, what is the maximum tolerable effect that we are prepared to put up with. What is the maximum effluent that we want passing Mud Lake? What is the maximum amount of disturbance of caribou herds that we want to put up with? How many geese are we prepared to sacrifice for the benefits of here?

Because if we have no standards the problem will be this, that we say, as long as we are taking steps to minimize the impact and all the geese are suddenly gone, we say, well, we tried to minimize the effect and geese were the price that we had to pay.

I think we have to know and the proponent needs to say what standards they have with regard to that, and that is all I would have, or, those are my concerns with the Draft Guidelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like to say something about your last item, if I might.

The question was raised this afternoon about significance, I think it was this afternoon. What criteria will be used to determine what is significant versus an insignificant impact, and we have clearly instructed the proponent in the guidelines to define such terms as he uses them. And, I think, with regard to your question: How much of a harmful impact are we prepared to put up with, that would probably be a combination of scientific factors and the opinion of people who are familiar with the geese or the caribou or whatever it is that is in question, a combination of their professional opinion regarding what would be a significant impact on that population, and would also be, in part, the opinion of the people who perhaps depend on geese for part of their food or who simply like to watch geese fly. The opinion on impact has to be, in part, a socio-cultural factor. So, we have thought about that in designing the guidelines that if the proponent says in his impact statement, that there will not be a significant impact on the populations of geese, then he has to at the same time explain what he means by that term.

MR. BARTELL: The difference is, in the way I see it, between the low level flying and the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. There in the second one you have a right to say. yes or no. In the other one, you have, let us minimize the impact and if all our efforts together in trying to minimize the effort or minimize the impact is not enough to save X or Y, there is seemingly no recourse other than being compensated.

I am not certain that we would want only to be compensated for geese or for caribou. Does that mean we get an extra ration on our social assistance? I mean I think that kind of thing becomes bizarre. I think there needs to be some kind of way in which we can say to the proponent -- the proponent says, yes, these are the standards which we set and there will be no more adverse effect other than this, and then there needs to be some,say if they beyond that, way in which we can hold them to that. In this process with low level flying I do not think there is, or, at least, I have not been able to see it; maybe there is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, in fact, that some of what you are asking for is beyond the limits of the process that we are involved in here.

The sort of impact that you describe should, if everything works right in the review, emerge as a residual impact of the low level flying. something that is going to happen regardless of what remedial measures anyone takes to offset it, and that should appear either from the impact statement itself, or in the Panel report, after having studied the impact statement and whatever we hear from any interested parties. They will be identified. They will be on the record as a residual impact for the Government of Canada to see. They will and the public will see this as a residual impact of that ongoing activity as long as it goes on.

It will then be up to the government to make judgments on whether they wish to do something about that situation or not, but, you are right in saying that it is beyond the capability of the Panel to do something about that because our job at that point will be over. We do not make the regulatory decisions. We have been appointed to give advice. So, some of what you say is true.

I wonder if somebody else on the Panel would like to add to what I said?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I think what you are saying is, really, what will we do if the residual impact, the impact that will remain after any mitigating measures, seems to be unacceptably high. I think the only honest answer to that right now is that we do not know. I think it will put the Panel in a very difficult moral position. I think it will have a very hard choice to take.

In earlier sessions we have had both here and in Schefferville representations have been made to us that we ask immediately for the Panel's mandate to be changed, so that we would, at least, have the freedom to recommend that if the impacts run exceptionally high the low level flights be terminated. That would, in a sense, be a partial solution to the problem that you are raising, and what we replied in that case was, that we would at the end of this first series of public hearings take under consideration all requests that have been made to us and we would study them in the light of all the public hearings, and we would make our decisions at that time.

But, I appreciate the problem you raise and I hope it does not arise, because it will be difficult for us.

MR. BARTELL: I hope it does not

arise as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Could I add something more?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, go right ahead.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I just wanted to comment on some of the other points you had raised, if I may.

To deal with the first one, the question of spent fuel, I think our intention was in using the term exhaust emissions rather than exhaust gases, that it would include spent fuel. I think if that is not unambiguously clear, we will have to perhaps think of adding in commas to include spent fuel.

On the second point, the one that you raised in relation to page 22, the breakdown of the civilian jobs into those for Labradorians and other people. I would hope that would be done. I am not sure that it would be appropriate for us to tell the proponent to do it. I think in my view the place where it would be done would be not in the description of the existing environment and so on, but in the later section, which I think is 6.6, dealing with the mitigative measures and the environment having been described, the Project having been described, its foreseeable effects having been described. At that point we ask the proponent to say, well, what can you do either to reduce the impact of the adverse effects or enhance the benefits of the good effects.

Now, I think it is at that point that the proponent would have to come to terms with this kind of issue. If there is a positive impact, a potentially positive impact on employment, what can the proponent suggest to make sure that that positive impact takes place as much as possible in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, in Labrador, or wherever.

So, it is at that point that he should use his imagination to propose this kind of thing.

MR. BARTELL: I would like to respond somewhat to that. In virtually every northern proposal where we end up having work in the north, across Canada -- in my Province of Saskatchewan -- it is the southerners who get the jobs, and in Saskatchewan we have token rules. For a uranium mine you have to employ so and so many northerners and it is never adhered to. So that is my concern, that if the people of this region are to experience any adverse effects, it must at least be balanced with any of the positive.

If they get all the adverse and none of the positive, then it brings the whole thing into question.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: I agree with you entirely. I was just trying to give you my view of where in the study we are talking about that kind of thing should be dealt with. I agree with you entirely, though, that it should be done. I agree with you that in practice it very often is not, and I mean I think that is in part a question of people exerting the appropriate political pressures to make sure that it is done.

MR. BARTELL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, something else just occurred to me. It has already been pointed out to the Panel today that we have to deal with the very sensitive question of what is a native person, small n for native in this area. I wonder now if you have given us another dilemma to deal with in having to decide who is an outsider and who is a local resident. How long would a person have to have been a resident here in order to escape being labelled as an outsider, and therefore not entitled to compete for certain jobs.

MR. BARTELL: The problem is -- I know that in Newfoundland unemployment is an extremely large problem as well. I do not know. It is not an easy problem, but I guess I would worry about a person who was unemployed or under-employed here in Goose Bay through the entire duration of now, looks with hope or some kind of hope for this kind of proposal, and there really is none because of the kinds of jobs that are offered.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: In the State of

Alaska I know that this question has been settled in part by regulations. The State government has, in fact, established varying residency requirements which give people preferences in terms of employment. I do not know whether a similar approach has been ever contemplated in Newfoundland and Labrador or not, but it is one avenue for resolving this kind of difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that a member of the audience would like to make a comment at this point. Would you like to stand and identify yourself for the record, please?

MR. JOHN McGRAW: My name is John McGraw and I have lived here for the past nine years, which I guess would be my residency requirement if I were asked what it should be. I have run into the same question before.

Most people here know me and it is difficult, as with all of us, to separate yourself from your job. Probably my friend, Ben, would describe my position a little bit differently than I would as vice versa.

I would like to speak about, if I may, for a moment about what this gentleman brought up and that has to do with balance; not in the context exactly of his but in a general, almost a philosophical way. Trying to establish balance on a committee such as yours is almost an impossible task, and there are those who will feel that it was done well and those who will feel it was done unwell and some will feel that that is balance.

Listening here this evening to the people who spoke, one would think that there is a slight imbalance there too. I would, however, like to go one step further and say where we will have an imbalance, and this goes back to Mrs. Feldsberg's comment on the meetings in St. John's and Montreal, I have no feeling one way or another as far as the question of a committee having meetings there, although personally with the five organizations mentioned as represented in Montreal and the possibility of the same 15 or 22 -- I am not sure which; some of them might have been double counted in St. John's who went before the other committee -- I would have rather have seen them here to discuss with us at the same time, because we will have little opportunity -- our people here will have little opportunity to talk with these people in Montreal or St. John's because we will be unable to -- most people will be unable to attend.

I will be able to attend but unlike here where I am a resident I really will have nothing to say. In the late lamented seal hunt, which had a very strong effect upon the people of this area, we had an imbalance. We had everybody in the Province; in fact, I can think of only two people by name who favoured the cutting out of the seal hunt, and there might have been a few people who never surfaced, but only actually two people who came forward and said they were against it, which was sort of most unusual.

This balance is going to come down to this infernal machine which is pointing at me up on the right-hand side - my friend, Kevin, the omni present Kevin who is sort of a ghost at the wedding feast at most of these meetings. I know Kevin quite well because of our close connection over the years and he is hardly ever in front of the camera and he does a very good job, but it is unlikely we will see Kevin in Montreal, but it is not unlikely that we will see cameras there and people behind those cameras and the same way in St. John's, and this omniscient camera will show the imbalance which I am fairly certain will be displayed in both of these places.

This concerns me, because, again, using the metaphor of the seal hunt where everybody in the place was in favour of; there was an imbalance outside of the area, which we were unable to lend ourselves to, or which we did not lend ourselves to, or whatever. Now that the body has been buried you can have an autopsy and decide what we should have done at that time. I speak not only for those of us who might be seen to favour it, but also so that the views of those who are against it will also be fairly presented in balance, because if they are shown in imbalance they will be discarded by other people. Rational arguments will be thrown out if they are too strongly one-sided. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McGraw, and thank you, sir.

We have a great discussion going here. Let us hear from somebody else. Yes, sir, would you like to come forward and speak? Please give your name for the record.

MR. BART JACK: My name is Bart Jack, Mr.Chairman. I represent the Naskapi-Montagnais, NMIA. I want to address the question raised by John McGraw.

I believe that from where we sit the situation probably looks to us from our point of view as much as John describes it as an imbalance too, but our problem is,that unlike Mr. McGraw we do not look at the CBC or any other people as a dark shadow of our's, which I seem to think that Mr. McGraw often finds himself into.

The unfortunate position that government people find themselves in is of no doing of our's. The basis on which Mr. McGraw sees himself and Kevin and probably ourselves as dark shadows, we cannot help that. The problem, however, remains that we would like to present our case to the committee, which we have done on two occasions already.

We think we have done our homework. We will continue to do our homework and if Mr. McGraw, with all the resources that he has at his disposal cannot do his homework, with all the government resources he has, then that is, indeed, unfortunate.

Therefore, no finger should be pointed at the CBC or the Native People or any other group as a dark shadow of his.

The only thing I can comment on is we have been following the events, as you know, from day one and the feeling that we have is that the situation may indeed be imbalanced, as Mr. McGraw puts its, but the situation that we find ourselves in is that this is a lobbying game and anybody is good at a lobbying game, including the government, of which Mr. McGraw is a part of.

So, the situation then rests in the hands of the players. We have a full deck of cards and it is up to the player to play his best hand, but I think we should not overlook the fact that there are, as Mr. McGraw points out, dark shadows amongst us, and if these dark shadows are following us then we have to do something about that.

The other thing I wanted to point out is that we were unfortunately criticized this afternoon for taking too much time, we felt, and today or this evening we find that there is a lack of intervenors. I would dare to say that if we had had another presentation today we probably would have made it, but, unfortunately, we will leave that aside until the October 13th hearings. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We still have lots of time. We have already seen that one gentleman had obviously done some homework and had prepared something but was hesitant to come forward for a long time. I hope that nobody else has done something like that and will go away tonight without having spoken to us.

The gentleman at the back, please come forward and give your name.

MR. TIM PEACOCK: My name is Tim Peacock, and I am a resident of Happy Valley.

What I would just like to ask the Panel is, a few weeks back on the national television there was the discussion going on about NATO and Goose Bay, and in response to some of the Reverend Buckle's queries a fairly high-ranking military officer stood up and suggested that he thought a hot line was going to be instituted whereby people could phone the military and say where the Innu or various other people in the country were at present and could they please avoid the area, and this would be a plausible way of avoiding clashes.

I was wondering what the Panel thought about this suggestion from a high-ranking military officer on the national television, because, obviously, people elsewhere in Canada might think that this is a reasonable suggestion whereas most people out there will realize that it is ridiculous to expect people to phone in on a hot line from somewhere in the bush. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I think that rather than try to make a comment on a reported comment by an unidentified officer of the military, that we would prefer to wait and see if such a proposal would come forward as part of the Environmental Impact Statement and reserve our comments to be made at that time.

Yes?

MS. FELDSBERG: Mr. Chairman, could I make the comment that from the Mud Lake point of view in the last 18 months, plus or minus a little, we have had excellent co-operation with the Military Coordination Centre, which Major McCabe previously described.

I cannot remember how I obtained it and I do not think it was by any subversive means but I did obtain the telephone number of the Military Coordination Centre approximately 12 months ago and I have used it ever since whenever Mud Lake has been overflown by mistake. This has happened a few times.

I make no hesitation in telephoning them immediately. Two years ago I was patronized. I was a nuisance. I was some local resident who probably did not know what I was talking about. I could not identify an aircraft. The fact that I was in the centre of my house and it flew past my window in the matter of one second was unfortunately my fault if I could not describe not only the make of the aircraft but even the identification numbers of it. I tried to explain that when you sit in a control tower with roughly five miles of visibility and an aircraft approaching you is one thing to be able to describe it. It is another to do it in a matter of seconds between three trees.

Gradually the atmosphere and the co-operation from the MCC has most definitely improved and they now listen immediately, respond immediately and even return our calls and say that the problem has been addressed within a matter of 20 or 30 minutes. We, needless to say, are very satisfied with this and it certainly does not happen very often but the telephone number of the Military Coordination Centre is not well published. I do not think it is listed in the local telephone directory. It is certainly not widely available and people have not been widely encouraged to use it to the extent that they could be.

I suggest that could be improved almost immediately, and it would satisfy some of the concerns; whether it would satisfy the camping and distant wilderness situations is another matter but I think MCC could improve their publicity a little bit. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I ask whether, in your opinion, subjective as that may be, the incidents of low level overflights over your community has decreased since you have started complaining about them?

MRS. FELDSBERG: They have occurred in different seasons. They have never been very many. It was pretty obvious to us that they were probably errors at the pilot level, that the Centre itself was not aware of unless we informed them. Once we had, I think, proved our credentials and had done our best to describe the direction of flight, the height, and the accurate time of the event, they were able to identify the aircraft.

I had an incident about three weeks ago when the officer in charge was able to identify the aircraft as I was speaking to him. We have had some interesting comments in the past including: I am afraid we are not able to identify the aircraft but we have to rely on the pilot's admission of his location when he returns to ground. We have no other way of being certain of it for ourselves. The Centre itself had to rely on the pilot's actual admission.

I would say the flights, such mistakes, such errors, have been approximately two or three in a flying season. That, of course, is very little for the number of sorties that are flown and we accept this and we accept the fact that it is probably part of the actual training process anyway; that errors can occur and it should be corrected. In that sense, I think we see ourselves as helping the military to improve their performance.

Maybe there have been a little additional incidents either when a new team has been in the area, or possibly when there have been additional visiting units from some new country. On the whole I think there is a general improvement and the incidents, I have to say, are little enough, but very noticeable when they happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wanted to ask you, have the effects, in your experience, been of the nature of nuisance or causing fright, or have there been physical effects, physical damage to property as broken windows or anything like that?

MRS. FELDSBERG: There has been no damage. I think they have been considered a minor nuisance, an irritant. I think one can definitely say that they are intrusive and offensive in that sense simply because we are well aware that the flight path is approximately five miles to the east of us. We know exactly where that flight path is. We know the aircraft should be there and they should not be over our community and in that sense they are intrusive and offensive. The height has been anything as low as about 500 feet, 500-1,000. Those are, obviously, not as low as they are in the low level situation but they are low enough when they are directly over your home and you know that contra to having chosen to live in Spruce Park you have chosen to live 15 miles away from the airport, and there is absolutely no need for such a flight to occur in the first place.

There are definite, and I believe it would be true to say also the Northwest area, examples of pilots straying from the flight paths. Whether they are genuinely disorientated or whatever the reason may be is open to question, but these do occur on an irregular basis and they are irritants. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Who is next? It is not that I want to stay here until 10:00 o'clock, particularly, but it is that I would like to hear from as many people as possible. Colonel David.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DAVID: I can clarify the situation with the Military Coordination Centre for the benefit of the Panel who are not familiar with what its activities are. But, yes, indeed, it was implemented, as mentioned earlier, in 1984 and it is going through a lot of growing pains. We are slowly getting the act together there and the phone-in system we are attempting to implement what we have done in the interim is all the key people in the outlying areas that would be able to pass forward we give them the base operator number and tell them to call the Military Coordination Centre. In other words, ask the operator to put him through.

We will accept reverse charges for calls to the Military Coordination Centre for concerns. This is a very small concession but I believe in the future that we will have a direct dial system to that Centre. We are still in growing pains inside. They are moving offices around and desks around and phones and we just put in new phones, so perhaps within the next flying season we will be able to implement the requirement that is being presented here.

I must agree with the comment made that if you get overflown call in and let them know. That is in some respects humourous but in other respects when you take into consideration the camps that are involved in the area, the majority of them all have some type of radio system that can call out and they have radio systems for their own communications or for medical support. In fact, several of the native camps have radio systems available as well to relay, if they choose to do that.

But, the bottom line is that that is

a way of co-operation and coordinating and minimizing the potential overflight.

In respect to the airport and vicinity of the airport, we will continually have the occasional overflight of say, Mud Lake, Happy Valley-Goose Bay or perhaps Northwest River on entry, because of the mixed VFR, Visual Flight Rule traffic, and IFR flight traffic. The people who are coming back in the majority of the overflights that have taken place in the case of Mud Lake are pilots supposed to be visual flight and have erred. Most cases that we have been able to determine they have made a straight mistake, not watching what they are doing, but watching other traffic arriving and either cutting inside them or whatever. Those are minor aberations in what I call normal airmanship and we have been dealing with them.

I believe the fact that we have been able to keep this to a minimum with all the increase in activity here would suggest that, perhaps, the way we are implementing airspace management here is to the advantage of everybody.

Our intent with the Military Coordination Centre is to improve and to provide the assistance to the people. The Coordination Centre is, for the military, a policing agency. If we have people that are out there doing things that we do not want done, if we can find out about it as soon as possible -- it is like the same problem we have in the local area: You are not supposed to speed but how many people get speeding tickets. We will always have a little bit of a problem like that but we have ways of dealing with it and I think the results are we are getting better at it.

There was one other thing I would like to have defined brought up tonight and that is spent fuel. I understand the fumes problem, a very valid thing, but I am not too certain what you mean by spent fuel when it comes to the aviation fuel. Would the Panel or would the individual who brought it up explain what that means?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would that gentleman like to come forward, please?

MR. BRADFORD: What I meant by spent fuel is that the fuel that goes through the engine is burned and whatever comes out the back I would call that spent fuel, exhaust. I am sorry, spent fuel I do not mean is raw fuel and it is just the exhaust.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DAVID: That clarifies it then and we are talking specifically of fumes and inefficient burning of a combustible substance and that is in the vicinity of the airport. But, what I was concerned about, that it might mislead the people to spend a lot of time trying to discover that there is excess fuel being dumped out the back of airplanes all over the country and contaminating the ground. Aviation fuel, if it does come out either from an overflow on a fuel tank or whatever, immediately vaporizes and I think, Peter, you know that quite well and there is no contamination. It is like what happens to the water in a kettle when it boils. So, I just wanted to bring that point up but the fumes thing I understand 100 per cent of what the problem is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much both of you.

I am now going to offer one last chance to anyone to come forward and speak to us.

All right then, I think we must have heard from everybody who wishes to be heard. I want to thank you all for coming, particularly the people who have spoken to us. I would like to offer my thanks to the Secretariat and to the Panel who have worked hard to organize these meetings. As I said before this is but the first round of meetings on this review. We have a mailing list for this Project; that is, the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office has a mailing list, and each and every item of information that goes out from that office goes to everyone on that list. If you are not on the list and would like to be, please speak to one of the members of the Secretariat who were identified earlier. You will all continue to be informed about the progress of the review and we look forward to seeing all of you again in the next round of meetings when we come through here. So, thank you again and goodnight.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned in Goose Bay at 9:10 P.M. to be resumed in Cartwright, Labrador, October 3, 1986.

Volume

5

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	CARTWRIGHT	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 3, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	5	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Cartwright Community Hall, Cartwright

DATE: October/octobre 3, 1986.

VOLUME: 5

INDEX

PAGE

Introduction by The Chairman 515

Presentation by Major David McCabe 532

SUBMISSION/QUESTIONS BY:

Jessie Bird 546

Manuel Pardy 555

John Hamel 567

-o0o-

---Upon commencing at 7:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Barnes. Normally I work for the federal government but tonight and in the case of these other meetings that we are holding across Quebec and Labrador this week and in the coming weeks I am functioning as the Chairman of this group which you see before you tonight, which we call an Environmental Assessment Panel.

Some of you may be wondering why we are here, so perhaps I should spend a few minutes explaining a little bit about who and what we are and what we are attempting to do.

As you know the Government of Canada is responsible in one way or another for a great many projects: Land-use projects, resource development projects, and from time to time has to make decisions whether or not these projects are going to be permitted to proceed.

In 1974 the government decided that it wanted to increase the amount of public information and public participation in that decision-making process, so it established at that time a process called the Environmental Assessment Review Process. This requires all departments of the federal government whenever they are in the position of putting forward a project to examine that project very carefully according to certain rules and guidelines set down under the process and to determine whether or not there is a need for that proposal for which they are responsible to be put through a public environmental review, such as the one in which we are involved.

For several years now the Department of National Defence has been responsible for the control of certain low level flight training activities out of Goose Bay and has been thinking in terms of the possibility of having established at Goose Bay a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO.

In February of this year, the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment and said, in effect, we have examined this ongoing low level flight training and the proposal for a NATO training centre and we feel that it should be subjected to a public environmental review, so would you please make the necessary arrangements. That is what the Minister did and that is why we are here tonight.

In a moment I am going to briefly outline the steps of the review and then talk a little more about the particular stage of the review that we are involved in here.

First, I would like to introduce to you the other members of the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table on your left, Mr. Tim McNeill, who owns and operates a small business in Makkovik, and has been appointed to the Panel particularly because he is knowledgeable about the concerns and interests of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Next to him is, Mr. Don Stewart, a retired Brigadier General in the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of a NORAD region and he was stationed for a time in Goose Bay.

Next to him and at my right is, Mr. Tom Northcott, a biologist, who has had extensive experience with wildlife in Newfoundland and Labrador and he is presently the Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and resource questions.

To my left is, Doctor Paul Wilkinson, also a biologist, who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant established in Montreal.

Finally, at the other end of the table is, Mr. William Jourdain, who lives in Sept-Iles and who has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in certain commercial enterprises in Sept-Iles. He worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years before his retirement from that position.

I mentioned that I work for the federal government. I am employed in the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa where for the past year or so I have been Director for the Atlantic Region for that office.

In my function as Chairman of this Panel I have a different sort of responsibility. Instead of reporting to my superior within the office where I normally work, I have a reporting responsibility directly to the Minister of the Environment as the Chairman of the Panel.

Now, to briefly outline the process in which we are involved I mentioned that in February the Department of National Defence asked the Minister of the Environment to appoint a Panel to conduct a public environmental review. That Panel was appointed in July of this year and was given a mandate in a document which we call the "terms of reference", which had been agreed upon between the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence. This terms of reference document tells the Panel what it should study and to a certain extent in what manner.

During the spring and summer of this year there were preliminary meetings held with agencies of the federal, provincial and municipal governments who are interested in this Project, and the results of those meetings were summarized and presented to the Panel. The Panel was also presented with a review of the existing information in the literature concerning a variety of subjects related to the review.

On the basis of all this the Panel sat down and spent many hours compiling a list of what it sees to be the issues in this review, what are the questions that need to be answered, what are the subjects that need to be studied.

Having done this, the Panel put together a document which will eventually become the guidelines for the preparation of a report called the Environmental Impact Statement. That is a report that the Department of National Defence is obliged to prepare under this process and it does so at its own expense. So, you will have the situation of the Panel giving instructions to National Defence and eventually a report called the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared and submitted to the Panel.

This Draft Guidelines document was issued by the Panel in August of this year and was immediately made public and distributed to a wide mailing list and certain representatives in this community are on that mailing list and, I believe, have had an opportunity to look at those guidelines.

In a moment I will go through those guidelines so you will have some understanding of what is contained in the document because I imagine that a great many of you will not have had an opportunity to see it. But, for the moment, I will continue on through the process.

At the present time we are involved in a series of public meetings, in a total of 17 communities in the Province of Quebec and in the Province of Newfoundland/Labrador. The main purpose of these meetings is to hear back from whoever is interested in giving us comments the views of all these parties about the content of that Draft Guidelines document. Has the Panel placed in that draft document everything that should be there? Is the information in there stated properly and clearly enough so that there will be no question about what is going to be studied in this review?

When these meetings are over at the end of October, the Panel will meet, will look at all of the information that has been gathered during the course of these meetings during September and October, and will decide where the Draft Guidelines need to be improved and amended or modified.

In December of this year the Panel hopes to be ready to present the final form of the guidelines to the Department of National Defence, who will then use that guidelines document as their instruction to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement. In order to do that, they will have to look at a great deal of existing information from a great many sources. They may to conduct some original studies to draw out some new information that may be needed, and they will then sit down and write this Environmental Impact Statement, and we anticipate they should be ready to present it to the Panel sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987. That document will then be immediately made public so that during a period, probably covering the summer and early fall of 1987, the Environmental Impact Statement will be examined by the Panel, by various agencies of governments and by interested members of the public.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Statement is satisfactory; that is, it meets the requirements of the guidelines document, the Panel will announce public hearings to discuss the Project. The most likely time for those hearings to be held is in the fall of 1987.

The final step of the review is the preparation of a report by this Panel, based on its examination of the Environmental Impact Statement and based on its review of already existing information, and that Panel report will discuss the Project, its expected impacts, and possible remedies to deal with those impacts. The Panel expects to be ready to present that report to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence sometime late in 1987 or early in 1988.

Now, coming back to the guidelines document itself, it is a fairly thick document as those of you who have had an opportunity to examine it will see, and I should mention that if anyone who does not already have a copy would like to have one we can easily arrange that.

Very briefly, first of all, the guidelines set out the scope for the study in a general way and talk about the sorts of methods that the Department of National Defence should use in preparing this assessment of its Project.

It then goes on to discuss the issues which the Panel has identified and then lists what it expects to see in the Environmental Impact Statement. In other words, it lays out sort of a table of contents for that document.

After that, presenting a series of definitions which are important to the understanding of the review, it presents a suggested scope for the study. First of all, it makes it clear that these guidelines apply to the entire Project including all activities associated with its construction, its operations and maintenance, its possible termination and de-mobilization.

On the basis of the Project, as it was described in the original referral document as presented to the Minister of the Environment, the Panel has decided to divide the Project into two components and this is the way in which the Panel wants the Project to be treated by the Department of National Defence when it writes its

Environmental Impact Statement.

First of all, there is a component consisting of the low level flight training being carried out in accordance with agreements between the Government of Canada and certain NATO Allies, the sort of activity that you people have been hearing about for a number of years now.

The other component of the proposal is the establishment and operation of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for training NATO air forces at Goose Bay, including the establishment and operation of weapons and training ranges and all the activities, facilities and installations associated with that, and we will hear a bit more about the Project and what it consists of in a few minutes.

The reason why the Panel wants the proposal considered in these two parts are, first of all, the low level flight training has been occurring since 1980 and, I understand, even earlier, and is expected to continue and possibly to increase in the coming years. The Panel has been asked in its terms of reference to assist the proponent, that is the Department of National Defence, in designing these activities in such a way as to minimize any adverse impacts.

On the other hand, in the case of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre the mandate of the Panel there is to recommend whether it should proceed or not and if it is to proceed under what conditions.

The guidelines go on then to talk about methods to be used and one very important point to be made here is that we are asking the proponent to consider the entire ecological system in the parts of Quebec and Labrador which might possibly be affected by the Project. That ecological system is to be interpreted as broadly as possible to include the human populations and their social and cultural structures as part of a life support system involving the air, the water, the minerals, the soil, the plants, animals, microorganisms, all of which work together to form a unit.

The guidelines go on with some details concerning how we are asking the proponent to use this ecological system approach. The next section of the guidelines lay out the issues which the Panel has identified and we have listed nine such issues. I will read each of these so you can understand exactly what the Panel views at the present time as the issues to be examined.

1. The effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife;

2. The effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use;

3. The opportunities for economic

development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the Project area;

4. The impacts of the Project on renewable resource-based commercial activities, such as for example outfitting;

5. The impacts on the natural environment of, first of all:

(a) construction activities associated with expansion of Goose Bay Airport, and secondly,

(b) exhaust emissions from increased flying activities;

6. The cumulative effects of the Project and of other projects an activities going on in the region;

7. The need for monitoring; monitoring to be conducted during periods of construction and monitoring to be carried out during periods of operation;

8. The impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges; and finally

9. The effects of the Project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. I would like you to note the wording there very carefully because we explain that the Panel has identified this as a very important issue while at the same time recognizing that it does not have a mandate to deal with the subject of land claims policy. We are not to make

deliberations on what is the policy of the Government of Canada in its negotiations with Native Peoples on land claims.

I mentioned that we have laid out sort of a table of contents for the Environmental Impact Statement. First of all, there must be a summary document which would be included in the body of the impact statement and would also be published separately, and in order to give you some idea of the task that lies ahead of this Panel in terms of the different groups that we have to deal with we are instructing the proponent to prepare the summary document in English and in French and also in a sufficient number of languages and dialects to meet the needs of the following groups: the Inuit of Kujjuag, that is Fort Chimo, and of Kangigsoalujjuag, that is George River, both in Quebec; the Inuit of Labrador; the Naskapi of Quebec; the Montagnais of Schefferville and the lower north shore of Quebec; and the Naskapi-Montagnais of Labrador.

This summary will bring together the important findings of the impact statement and must be written in such a manner as to allow the readers of the summary to focus immediately on the major predicted impacts on the principal areas of uncertainty that remain and of important matters. It has to be written in terms understandable to the general public, especially the public that is likely to be affected by the Project.

Some of the other important items in the contents of the impact statement are as follows: There must be a section dealing with the justification for the Project, which should describe the purposes of the Project and how it fits into international, national or regional treaties and plans, agreements, et cetera. The reason for asking for this is that both the Panel and we feel the public need to have a better understanding of the justification and the rationale for the Project as a background to the examination of the issues.

We point out that the Panel has no mandate to pass judgment on the need for the Project. That is the responsibility of the Department of National Defence. Nevertheless, it is important for the Panel to understand the reasons for the Project in order to be able to weigh adequately the environmental and the socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the Project.

The proponent is also required to identify and describe all associated projects and activities including ground and air-based monitoring facilities, alternate landing strips which may be needed, refuelling sites, and to treat all of these as forming a part of the Project for the purposes of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.

Alternatives have to be considered. The proponent must describe the major alternatives to the Project including some that may have already been rejected in sufficient detail to allow the reader to compare and evaluate the costs, the benefits, and the environmental risks of the Project and its alternatives. These might include, for example, alternative sites for runways and infrastructure, buildings, et cetera; alternative flying areas; perhaps the increased use of flight simulators combined with low level flight training.

Next there is a need for a Project description. There is already a Project description that was submitted to the Minister in February of this year. The Panel, in examining that, has identified additional information that is needed almost immediately to provide a better understanding of the Project to both the Panel and to the public. The proponent has already been invited to supply this additional information and, indeed, some of that will be provided to you this evening.

We ask for this information under three headings. First of all, under the category of low level flight training under existing agreements; secondly, under the heading of the proposed NATO Tactical Weapons Fighter Training Centre; and thirdly, under the heading of tactical weapons ranges, which may form a part of either of those two components.

Having described the Project the proponent is next required to provide a description of the existing environment into which the Project will be placed. In other words, we must have the documentation of the present state of the environment. This would include information under such categories as geology, climate, air quality, water quality, flora and fauna including fish, marine mammals, birds, terrestial mammals, plants, and in addition to that a description of the present socio-economic environment and resource use. Under this heading in order to make sure that you understand that we are giving equal emphasis to this part of the review, I would like to briefly list the particular items. First of all, the distribution and characteristics of the human populations; the economic, cultural and social setting, including present and projected revenues without the Project; an evaluation of the socio-economic impacts of the low level flight training which has been going on since 1980; the historic, existing and projected future resource use, including such items as commercial hunting and fishing, sport hunting and fishing, et cetera; information on travel and communications in the area, including air travel by subsistence hunters, sport hunters, anglers, tourists, et cetera;

information on commercial aviation, including the use of the airspace by international and domestic flights; a summary of aircraft movements at Goose Bay airport in each of the last six years; information on areas of special status, such as sanctuaries, ecological reserves, areas of archeological importance. We would like to see the urban development plan for Happy Valley-Goose Bay and we wish to know the status of land claims negotiations involving all of the native groups within the area of anticipated impact of Project.

The next section of the Environmental Impact Statement would attempt to describe the expected environmental and socio-economic impacts of the Project, including, as I have indicated earlier, those of the alternatives identified in the previous section.

Having described the predicted impacts, the proponent must then put forward what we call mitigative measures or remedial measures, and this term has to be interpreted broadly so that it can include mechanisms for compensation to groups or individuals likely to be affected, and mitigative measures must also include those to enhance or to prolong beneficial impacts, because that side of the picture is equally important.

Having done that, there must be a discussion then of the residual impacts of the

Project. This means the impacts for which remedial measures cannot be devised and those that will remain even after the successful application of mitigating measures. In other words, when you have anticipated the impacts, when you devise means to deal with them to the best of your ability, there may be some impacts about which you can do nothing.

Finally, there must be a plan for a monitoring program. The purpose of monitoring, or purposes would be three in number. First of all, to test the validity and the accuracy of the predicted impacts. Secondly, to identify and evaluate impacts that were not or could not be predicted at the time of writing the impact statement. Thirdly, to test the effectiveness of the mitigative measures that were put in place.

The section on the monitoring program must describe and must indicate the estimated cost and must identify the responsibility for the monitoring program designed to achieve those three objectives. In conjunction with that, the proponent must also provide information on how he would intend to react to the information coming out of that monitoring program.

I wonder, are there any questions at this point; if there is anything that you would like me to clarify with regards to the contents of this guideline document?

If not then, as I indicated earlier, the purpose of these meetings is mainly to hear comments back on these guidelines, and in addition to that we have been hearing, as we expected, other presentations from interested parties who, seeing the Panel in public for the first time, felt that they would like to present information concerning their views of the Project and any position they may have taken, and we have heard from native groups, from municipal councils and other interested parties.

It has become the common practice in all public meetings held by Panels of this sort, that we invite along a representative of the proponent to provide information concerning the Project so that both the public and the Panel can be sure that they have a good grasp of the nature of the project that is under review. I would like to introduce to you now Major David McCabe, who has been invited to the meeting, and who will give us a brief presentation concerning the Project and who will, after that, be available to answer any questions that you might have about the Project itself. Major McCabe, would you like to go ahead now, please.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, Ladies and gentlemen of Cartwright.

I would first like to thank you for giving me as a representative of the proponent, the Department of National Defence, an opportunity to briefly, as possible, explain some of the proposals that the Chairman has been discussing this evening.

I should probably mention a little bit about my own background or credentials, as it were, for my presence at these hearings. I spent the first few years of my military career at Goose Bay as an Air Traffic Controller, and I have flown there on several occasions as a fighter pilot. For the past two years I have been in Ottawa as the Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, and this summer I added to my responsibilities by getting involved with all of the expansion proposals for Goose Bay.

I do not want to spend a lot of time on the history of Goose Bay. I think you people are probably quite familiar with its history and the military activity there over the years. I will just say that Goose Bay has seen a constant military presence ever since it was built in 1941, albeit at various levels of activity. At the peak of its activity in earlier years we saw nearly 12,000 military personnel and dependents living in Goose Bay.

Since 1980, there has been a noticeable increase in military flying, specifically low level flying. With the initial interest shown at that time with the German Air Force in commencing flying operations at Goose Bay, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low flying activity, which also included consideration of the requirement for practice target ranges.

This evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activities and it was not intended to be an in-depth, on-site study by specialists. The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible, but as existing data was rather inclusive with respect to jet aircraft it was decided to take a cautious approach and it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established.

In order to coordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner a Military Coordination Centre was established at Goose Bay in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel the Military Coordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises air crew on a daily basis of local restrictions, such as caribou migrations and active fishing and hunting camps in the low level training area.

The northern training area has been sub-divided in order that it can be closed off to avoid large caribou migrations and calving areas, as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on the air crew maps with a five-mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by the low flying aircraft.

In a further effort to better handle Allied and military flying activity at Goose Bay, Canada concluded a two-year negotiation process this year and signed a multi-national Memorandum of Understanding with each of the Allied users. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which existed in the past with several federal departments. Each Allied user under the current Agreement must share in common-use facilities; that is,things that are used by all of the Allies, such as runways, et cetera, and each of these are cost-shared on an equal basis.

The Agreement also covers dedicated facilities like barracks and hangars which the user pays for entirely. As well, each user is limited in number of aircraft and personnel which can be in Goose Bay at any one time. Any other nation wishing to train at Goose Bay in the future must become party to this Memorandum of Understanding.

Currently there are four signators to the Agreement; these being the air forces of Canada, United States, United Kingdom and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level flying activity.

The Canadian Forces support the long-range radar at Melville and the approach control radar facilities and provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft. As well, as of March of this year the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay on a permanent basis. The United States Air Force continues to primarily support transient aircraft on their way to Europe. The Royal Air Force, although permitted in the Agreement up to 25 aircraft, currently maintains nine Tornado fighter bombers at Goose Bay during the flying season, which typically runs from early March to late October. The German Air Force is somewhat closer to its limit of 25 aircraft and they rotate between Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha jets.

Current operations consist primarily of tactical missions of between two to four aircraft at a time flying at a variety of altitudes down as low as 100 feet above ground in designated areas for usually one to one and half hours per mission. The mission usually entails navigation training, tactical manoeuvring, and, on occasion, delivery of inert or practice weapons on a practice target range. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminant devices which sometime contain a small smoke charge to indicate impact point on the ground.

Currently, there is only one such

traget range licenced for use. It is situated in the southern training area, approximately 65 miles from Goose Bay. It is a circle, eight nautical miles in diameter, and is located in an open sandy area previously burned out in a forest fire. The area is clearly marked with signs printed in English, French and two native languages.

A second proposed practice target area is being examined in the northern training area but it has not received final approval at this time. Local interest groups are being consulted as well as provincial officials on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability to all concerned.

The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding. In conjunction with this proposed increase, some development of the existing southern practice range have already started. This includes development of a simulated airfield complex with supporting facilities such as simulated surface-to-air missile sites and operations centres. These are all constructed of basic materials such as logs and plywood and are meant to be replaceable as required.

There is no intention at this time to use live weapons on this range.

Flying training by the current users

will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying and may include some limited night and poor weather flying. These two activities are designed to train air crews in the use of the terrain following radar equipment currently found in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by current users, other nations have recently shown some interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Canada right now is in the process of negotiating a formal agreement with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing training facilities at Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present the Dutch hope to commence a half season training program during the summer of 1987, flying F-16 fighters. Initially 10 to 12 aircraft would be involved and about 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed at this time between the two governments.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity.

Before I provide details of this proposal let me give a brief background to the NATO training centre Project. Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO air force is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe with a concentration in West Germany. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities.

Recognizing a need to oversome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained air force, NATO began studying the feasibility of established an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO Nations.

Nations were asked to submit their training requirements and based on these statistics a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility, a full-scope facility, to cater to all the training requirements.

As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in a Phase I Report, as it is called, submitted in June of 1983. Two countries have since offered potential sites for the centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and Turkey has offered Konya Air Base.

Site surveys were conducted of the two sites last year; Goose Bay being done in October and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group to NATO. The NATO body is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year.

Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host countries, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design of the centre.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December of 1988. During this phase if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered then the alternate site would be considered. The training centre is expected to commence full operations in the early nineties, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre Project in its optimum full scale would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 22-week detachments each year, or, for about 40 weeks of the year.

Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties by transport-type aircraft every two weeks to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1,300 ground personnel transitting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1,700.

As these support personnel would be on two or three year postings at Goose Bay many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by as many as a thousand or 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities, and consumer product stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities such as a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season in Lake Melville or expansion of the Trans-Labrador highway system.

As far as types of training activities, which could be carried out at the NATO Centre, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model of this centre. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. It suffices to say, that as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaisance similar to that done now, air combat training at medium to high altitudes, which would include some supersonic flight from time to time, electronic warfare training using aircraft on-board electronic equipment and ground-based equipment, practice weapons delivery and ideally they are looking for four such ranges similar to what we have now, live weapons delivery with three ranges being required, tactical air support of marine operations which is a fancy name for anti-shipping and that would involve a sea range, which I will get into more detail later as I think it would be of particular interest to the people of Cartwright, and last, but not least, flag-type exercises as we call them. These are are very large exercises involving multiple aircraft of different types all flying at the same time supporting each other towards a common goal.

Several of these requirements in the scope of this Project are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which prevent these activities being carried out. This includes the sea range, which I mentioned earlier, which is merely an area for aircraft to fire at targets towed by ships or to conduct simulated attacks and tactical manoeuvres against shipping such as naval destroyers, et cetera.

Several such ranges already exist

off the coast of Canada, particularly around the Maritimes and the west coast and off both shores of the United States.

Another example of a desirable only feature would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or totally unpopulated, it would probably have to be established ideally I think over the ocean.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges that I mentioned earlier, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons' training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance or weapons coming off the aircraft. This system is known as a "no-drop bomb scoring" system and it has many obvious advantages such as protection of the environment and significant cost-savings due to the reduction in the expenditure of weapons.

Such a system would likely be part of the NATO training centre complex. Should a live weapons' area still be required for the centre very stringent criteria would govern the selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a Project are, obviously, directly proportional to the scope of the Project.

The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study on the expanded current operation and the NATO Project. With reference to the latter only a full scope optimum facility was examined as was detailed in the Phase I Report I mentioned earlier.

The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative. As any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular operational phase, the ongoing daily operation. Of possible interest to communities other than the Happy Valley-Goose Bay community and its immediate neighbours in the area is the requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency for bad weather diversion.

Goose Bay, being quite isolated, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the NATO training centre might require forward operating locations to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role. Both of these alternate field roles would require some upgrading of local facilities, such as runway extension, refuelling capabilities and accommodations. Potential locations that were considered by the NATO Working Group during its survey last October are Schefferville, Wabush, and Churchill Falls, and the main reason there being that they focused their attention on locating or establishing the NATO Centre on the north training area that exists today, which is indicated on the map behind me.

The southern training area would still likely see a continuation of low level flying activity such as we have today.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals which have been discussed and studied to date are based on the assumption that a full scale centre would be constructed. However, I think, as we all know, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military programs are not exempt.

As actual planning and design details are worked out over the next few years and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Panel members for giving me this opportunity to address the public of Cartwright this evening and

I would certainly be happy to answer any questions that I am able to concerning this Project or anything else that I might possibly be able to help you with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

Would anyone in the audience like to ask Major McCabe a question about anything that he has just told us? Yes, would you care to come forward and use the microphone so that it will all go on the transcript and please identify yourself for the record.

MS. JESSIE BIRD: I am Jessie Bird, the air-to-sea range where would that be located? How far offshore?

MAJOR McCABE: I have to refer back to my emphasis on the proposal idea, because the actual site selection has not been made yet it stands to reason that detailed planning has not actually taken place. There are a couple of areas. When the team was in Goose Bay, the discussion of the sea range they looked at a couple of areas and knowing that there were a number of activities off the coast such as potential petroleum drillings, et cetera, and fishing activities, we said that, obviously, that would have to be very closely examined before the actual establishment of that area would take place.

Because of the distance to the coast

from Goose Bay and taking into account fuel requirements and that, they would obviously look for something that was basically straightline out, sort of shortest distance, but they would certainly have to take into account any local activity that was in place. It may well be that due to constraints in the area they would not be able to establish one at all.

MS. BIRD: Yes, because if they come, as you say, in a straight line out, they are going to be over part of the breeding grounds for the northern cod stock.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes. I must mention that it is really difficult to get into a lot of detail about the activity on these ranges but I can assure you, having used such ranges myself, the kind of weaponry that is used and the kind of activity that takes place in these areas certainly has not been to date detrimental to any of the fishing or mammals, their living area. For example, they use practice weapons. They are bullets, if you like, for gunnery, but there is no explosive or anything like that, any contaminants used.

So, again, that would have to be very closely examined from an environmental aspect, but specific areas like that would certainly have to be identified.

MS. BIRD: One more question, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

You mentioned for bringing in the fuel the possible extension of the shipping season going into Lake Melville. That would just be, say, later into the fall and earlier into the spring?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes.

MS. BIRD: Would allowances be made for the local seal harvest? People in the Goose Bay area and I would imagine Rigolet as well go to the ice and hunt now for their own use, and for the people travelling back and forth in the winter they would not be really impressed finding open water.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, indeed, that kind of thing would be examined and I think if that kind of thing presented a problem I am quite sure that they would have to do something else like, for example, expanding the storage facility or something like that. The key there is to ensure that they have enough fuel in place to conduct the full flying program.

I mentioned the possible extension because I know that trials have been done with the icebreakers to see the feasibility of that and I think you all probably know it is feasible, although at an expense. Again, that kind of thing, those local considerations would definitely have to be considered and weighed.

MS. BIRD: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Would anyone else care to ask a question? If not then, thank you very much, Major McCabe. I hope that you now have a better understanding of the Project and of this environmental review process than you had about an hour ago.

I would like to introduce several other people who are assisting the Panel this evening. First of all, travelling with the Panel and assisting it in travelling arrangements, arrangements for meetings and in many other ways are a three-member Secretariat. I would like to identify each of those persons and ask to stand as I name him so you can see who they are.

First, the Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carrol Martin. Assisting him are, first of all, Mr. Michel Bourgon, and Mr. Jim Clark. If you would like to be on the mailing list for past information and all future information on this review, if you would like to have any other information concerning the review or information concerning the environmental assessment process generally, there are many publications that we could provide; whatever your needs, please go to either of these three gentlemen and give your name and address and your needs will be looked after.

Sitting at the table at the side of

the room is Mrs. Pauline Munro, who is our Court Reporter who is taking down an official record of all that is being said here tonight and who will, in due course, produce a transcript so that the Panel have it to examine and so that the public can also see what went on in this meeting as in all of our other meetings. So, those transcripts will be available on request if anyone would like to have them.

Now, in a moment it will be time to hear from you. I understand we have two presentations but before that I would like to call a five-minute break. There is hot water over on the side table to make tea or coffee and there are some biscuits and things there as well. We will break for five minutes and then hear from those amongst you who would like to speak to the Panel. Thank you.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before we continue with any speakers, I would like to give recognition to a person without whom, perhaps, this whole exercise would not function nearly so well. You would not be able to hear me so well and we would not have a very good record of the meeting because there would not be a very good sound signal going to our Court Reporter.

Our Audio Technician, Mr. Sicoli,

seated there at the back of the room.

Now, to continue I understand that Mayor Jessie Bird would like to have something to say to the Panel. Would you please come forward and sit at the table on the side and be comfortable and say whatever you would like to say.

---SUBMISSION BY MAYOR JESSIE BIRD:

We, as a Council, have briefly discussed the proposed NATO base and what it would mean for our area and basically the only thing we could see the direct impact would be the possibility of people from our community finding jobs, be it temporarily or permanently in Goose Bay. We would like to know what kind of employment would be generated in the short term and long term for people who had no, shall we say, technical training, and in some instances for jobs they could obtain the training, say either in Goose Bay at the Vocational School or soon to be the Community College or elsewhere in the Province. How much training would they need and things of that nature?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you asking for information this evening, or are you asking us to be sure to include a requirement for that information in the guidelines for the impact statement?

MS. BIRD: I think we would like to see it included in the guidelines.

Bird, sub.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, Major McCabe, would you be able to respond at all to that question at the present time, or would you prefer not to?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, I can respond a little bit to that because I did mention a study that is being done by the Department of National Defence. I have seen an interim report on that. They are using, incidentally, a national model for sort of a computer model that they apply to any kind of industrial development where they are able to establish or come up with hypothetical numbers of jobs, a breakdown of types of jobs, and they get quite specific at it; I was surprised, and then they look at the national level, the provincial level and the local level. They are also able to predict potential revenues that might come forth.

Now, that has not been completed yet and, again, the emphasis there is on the fact it is a model. They have used in this case, for example, the base in Cold Lake which is very similar to what we predict Goose Bay would be like if the NATO centre went in there.

So, it is useful, or will be useful to give an idea. Now, I mentioned there are two phases there which would be an increase of employment, if you like, or, availability of

Bird, sub.

employment. The obvious one which I think would see probably the largest increase of jobs, albeit temporarily, would be the construction phase.

I am not going to get into numbers or anything because I am sort of grabbing at straws and that would not be fair to you people.

I think that is also the phase where you could expect the largest number of jobs which might be available to the average person who may not have any real special training or whatever. You did mention the Community College and I know the principal there, Mr. Quinlan, is extremely concerned and has expressed to the Panel a desire to have included in the guidelines as much detailed information as possible as soon as possible of the types of jobs that could be created for the very reason you are talking about, and that is, so they can set courses up within the curriculum for the local people in the area.

The obvious thing, as I say, would be in the construction stage and would be the standard things of the labourers, carpentry, plumbing, electrical work. The operational phase would, obviously, fall into two maybe quite different categories. There would be maintenance personnel required and that could be anywhere from janitorial-type activities to vehicle maintenance people, vehicle drivers, et cetera, right up to computer operators and computer technicians and that kind of thing.

Now, some of these people would be located at the base. Some of them would be possibly located out in the training area at some of the manned targets sites, as we call them, because there is electronic equipment involved in that. So, there is really a very wide diversity of jobs there, a variety of jobs, and I cannot really give you much more detail on that other than to say, from what I have seen, I think there would be sort of something for everyone as far as types of jobs.

Does that help any?

MS. BIRD: Thank you. That is pretty all we came up with after going through the proposed outline. Apart from that we could not see anything that was obviously missing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Would anyone on the Panel care to ask a question of the Mayor?

MR. STEWART: I guess a personal view on the preparation of the statement by the Department of National Defence. The numbers can be impressive depending on where you sit, I suppose, and I personally would hope that before the proponent uses numbers that some thought is given to what they mean to certain people be it in Cartwright or wherever, so that we do not end up with coming back to the same issue six months or nine months from now: What does that translate into jobs or whatever the case may be?

I think we have been hit with that a couple of times already as we have travelled around and I think the guidelines when we get around to finally polishing them up and handing them off to DND will certainly address that area, Mr. Chairman, and I think you would agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.

Would anyone else on the Panel care to make a remark or pose a question?

I have not been advised of any other speaker for this evening but since we are here and we have come all this way we certainly would like to hear from anyone else from the community who feel that he has something to say. Please do not hesitate to come forward. As long as it has something to do with the review that we are conducting here or the Project that is under review, please feel free to speak to us.

If you wish to speak I would like you to come forward and use the microphone and give your name for the record, please?

MR. MANUEL PARDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Manuel Pardy and I am a resident of Cartwright. You have covered so many different items it is pretty difficult to remember them all so most likely I will forget half or probably 99 per cent of the things I would like to, at least, hear a response to.

The one thing, in particular, that comes to my mind of immediate attention and that, the record of the military in their clean-up. I am familiar with, since I have lived here all my life, the site here in Cartwright. Now, from day one when the contractors landed on our shores they began to leave a mess on the beaches and around the construction site, around their base camps and so on. They left a mess at the mouths of our rivers where their personnel have spent many hours fishing with their beer cans, their beer bottles, their grub containers and so on, and especially the PCBs, the polychlorinated byphenols, that has been left around. The site itself is a disgrace; not just to Cartwright but I think it is a disgrace to Canada to have such a mess left and not attented to.

I believe that if it was left to the people of Cartwright at one time there would have been a certain amount of clean-up but nobody seemed to want to take responsibility of the site itself, so the people who wished at that time to remove materials that was usable at the time could not find a handle on just who had the responsibility. Crown Assets Disposal would not give any answers. They would not say they owned it. The military did not want to say they owned it, and as a result the usable material was scrounged and just torn up and a huge mess left in its place.

Now, if that is the kind of record that we are going to see from the expanded military operation in Goose Bay, I, as a resident of Labrador, would not want that to happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to respond, Major McCabe?

MAJOR McCABE: I have sort of a couple-part answer to you. One really ties in with what the Chairman spoke about in his initial introduction where we spoke about the government's increasing concern about the environment in general, and, of course, in 1974 when we started the requirement for environmental studies, et cetera, to be done for future projects. It is an indication of the change in attitude of the government and I think the change in attitude of the Canadian citizens in general.

I would suggest that possibly all of us, including local residents, maybe were not so concerned about environments years ago when this kind of thing was put into place. People have changed a lot that way and the government is no exception.

We are undertaking, the Canadian Forces, right now a clean-up program of the Pinetree Line. It is being closed down, the Cadin

Pinetree Line. A number of the sites that are currently active will be closed down and cleaned up. Some of the old sites like Saguelac and Hopewell and Cartwright are going to be cleaned up. The intention, as I understand it, is to use as much local labour as possible. I think the intent, from what I have seen in my readings and little informal sessions in Ottawa in the National Defence Headquarters is that they are going to attempt to return the sites to the original state as much as possible, which, having been up there myself today at noon, I see as a formidable task. But,I also certainly understand what you are saying and the fact that it is disgrace.

I am glad to see that you did not put the blame totally on the Canadian Forces because there were other people involved at those at the time. They are now still in Canadian soil and they are Canada's problem, I suppose, but the program it is not a proposal. It is a plan and I believe considerable funds have already been allocated to it, and I believe work is starting on a number of the sites. The specific plans for the clean-up of Cartwright I do not have any details on.

I can assure you any future developments that the military particularly is involved in will be very careful of during the construction phase of the environment, particularly with respect to the local community. Should there be contractors involved with the construction of a military site, I cannot speak for it. I can only speak for uniformed personnel, and I think that is only fair.

But, Goose Bay, if it is built to the level that we hope it will be, once again, we will be looking away down the line to possible shutdowns. We have to consider that type of thing should there be a requirement to phase things out or whatever. All of that, in fact, has been brought out in previous sessions in other locations, a concern for that, because it has not been looked after before, and I can assure you it will be in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: I could add to what Major McCabe has said to show that we have given some thought to this in preparing the guidelines document. Under the heading of the Description of the Project on page 25, there is an item calling for:

> "plans for the abandonment of the whole or any part of the Project, including a description of facilities that will be left in place, a detailed plan for dismantling or demobilizing other facilities, plans for reclaiming affected lands, and details for the release, loss, storage or ultimate

> disposal of any gases, liquid or solid contaminant (including live and dummy munitions) stored or otherwise situated in any part of the Project area."

So, we hope with a requirement in there that will appear in the Environmental Impact Statement a commitment to deal with all of these items as part of the Project.

Would you like to say anything further, Mr. Pardy?

MR. PARDY: With regard to that, no. I just would like to have it on the record that I would not want to see it go ahead if we took a relaxed attitude toward it.

But, you did mention about the dismantling of the system. Are there recommendations being made to the social side of the whole affair as far as the pull-out of NATO or whatever in regards to what impacts we are talking of when we talk about people losing their jobs and so on?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the principle of the guidelines would apply equally well to that. For example, if it were predicted that as a result of a closedown of a part or all of the Project, that there would be people unemployed then the proponent is obliged in the impact statement to discuss how that effect could be minimized; what do you do with the people who are put out of work?

How can you ease the blow to them, that sort of thing.

MR. PARDY: I am referring to our own closing of this site again, because when this site closed down the record stands that there was nothing to replace the people's jobs that were lost. All those people were displaced; there were a handful kept on, but the rest of them as well as the revenue from the operation of the site was lost to the community of Cartwright after having brought in a large number of people to the area and thinking they were getting jobs and so on, and when the site closed down everyone was left: Where do we turn from here?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think part of the reason why this environmental assessment process is in place now is that we would all prefer that that sort of thing not happen again, and we would like to take measures in advance and commit to measures in advance so that that would not happen. So, any adverse effects of a closedown would be handled properly and there will be plans in place ahead of time to deal with that situation.

MR. PARDY: I would also be interested in the infrastructure and so on as far as roads and utilization of air services and sea transport is concerned.

How big a proportion of the military activity would use the private sector? Or, are you expecting the major load of freight and personnel to be handled by the military itself?

Supposing we do get NATO in Goose, I would like to see utilization of the private sector, because of the infrastructure that would come along with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you able to respond to that at the present time, Major?

MAJOR McCABE: I have to really look at personal experience here and the way things are done in projects and activity areas that the military is involved with.

I think I can safely say that your concerns there certainly will be fulfilled in actual fact because the military in some sense -- as I mentioned earlier, transport aircraft. We do use military aircraft for some resupply, but we also do use a lot of civilian shipping, for example; we charter civilian aircraft, a perfect example is the very large exercise that is just winding down in Norway that has been going on for about six weeks and Goose Bay has seen a large number of chartered aircraft that has been used solely for military purposes. In support of that exercise to and from Europe a large number of merchant marine shipping is used and civilian shipping.

So, I think, once again, particularly in the large initial phase there would be heavy utilization of civil resources. There would have to be. The military is really not geared to that kind of thing in a lot of cases. So, you would see a lot of utilization.

MR. PARDY: About the utilization of charter, because I am working for Labrador Highways does not mean I am plugging for Labrador Highways, but I think what I am referring to is the build-up of our own scheduled services. Now, I have witnessed the use of helicopters and a lot of charter service along the coast. This detracted from the service that the scheduled airlines could provide.

I am sure that if a lot of charters were to be used then the schedule service would again lose its -- I do not know what term to put in there -- but what I am saying is that the more chartered services that are used the less the scheduled services are going to perform.

We are such small in numbers we have to pay high prices for our services. Now, if we had double the numbers, then hopefully at the cost of those services the type of service would improve and what I am saying is that if you use charter then that detracts from the type and the quality of service that we would get from our scheduled carriers.

MAJOR McCABE: By the use of charter, are you referring to outside-owned charter as causing a problem or sort of taking over the local operators to use as charter?

MR. PARDY: Either way the local service would be affected either in shipping or in air.

MAJOR McCABE: I probably misunderstood your original question. To my mind the use of local charter, for example, in support of the build-up or military-related activities still ends up with the same goal in the sense that it is increased revenue to the local population.

If it interrupts the local service, that is something in a sense which is more the operator's responsibility and possibly with his increased revenues he can increase his fleet. I do not know.

The alternative, obviously, which I think you would not want to see would be use of military aircraft only in which case your service is not interrupted nor are your revenues increased.

I think in that line; not so much to support a direct military thing, but with the increase in population into the area I think you could see a lot more use of the local services for tourist-related activities, et cetera, so there would be an increase there. I do not foresee any interruption in local services. If anything, it might be improved because of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. I think Mr. Stewart would like to make a comment.

MR. STEWART: I just wanted to add a comment. The sector that you are talking about, the aviation business, is just one aspect of it and the direction that is included in these guidelines obliges the Department to address all those areas and if he talks about an expansion he has to talk about the economic impact be it positive or negative, I suppose.

It will not get down, I would not think -- at least, I personally would not expect it to get down to differentiating between a civilian airline as opposed to a charter operator, a scheduled air line, that sort of thing. But, the impact of an expansion and whether it is in Goose Bay per se or in the transportation system as far back as St. John's or Montreal even, will likely come out of that study giving us some indication of the scope and the depth of the impact.

MR. PARDY: There was one other point that I would like to talk about and that is the caribou. Again, I think someone mentioned earlier that they were not exactly sure of the activity of the caribou and I believe caribou have always been a part of the lifestyle of not only the native but all of the Labrador people. I think every effort should be made in protecting the species, in keeping a very close track of its activity and being sure that your designated zones are truly effective in the protection of its activity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pardy, I think the Panel does recognize that there is certainly a lack of information about certain aspects of the caribou behaviour, caribou lifestyle and all this sort of thing. There is one study that is already underway which began before the Panel was appointed and it is a study being done under contract for the Newfoundland Wildlife Division.

Now, it may be that the Panel when it has examined all of the information being presented to it in these meetings may decide that it needs to require some other study of the caribou to be done as well. So, we are certainly aware that the caribou is one of the more important species of wildlife that have to be considered in this review.

Would you care to continue?

MR. PARDY: There was one other thing and that is for the record, recognizing that we have to try to keep up with the rest of the world and Labrador is so far behind I believe it would be in the interest of Labrador to welcome the NATO effort in coming into Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your

presentation, Mr. Pardy.

Would anyone else like to come forward? Yes, please. You can speak at the floor microphone, if you wish, or you can go to the table and sit down, whichever you prefer. Please give your name for the record before you start to speak.

MR. JOHN HAMEL: I am John Hamel, a resident of Cartwright. If I may, I would like to refer to the map on the wall concerning the caribou migration route.

The caribou migration route has been one of the main concerns, my main concern, ever since the activity of the military training in that area, and I guess the problem has gone beyond repair, from my point of view, because I believe that the caribou migration route has been disrupted, changed somewhat, before military activity-training ever started.

You may wonder why I think that way. I am not too familiar with that part of Labrador. I have never travelled there as a trapper or a hunter, but I have talked to experienced hunters and trappers and I have heard them say what they thought was the migration route of the caribou. They migrated southward and southeastward, inland, in a counter clockwise direction, and they migrated back to the north along by the coast.

Now, if I may refer to the map, those

red lines here, are they the areas of flying activity?

I was told that the caribou migrated inland this way and they came out this way and went back along by the coast. I believe that the migration route was disrupted because of this large man-made lake, that was put there sometime before flying started to the level that it is now.

I have been told that this lake here is 2,700 square miles of lake. Now, if a caribou comes to a lake or a body of water that is so large as this, they cannot see across; they do not know that lake from the Atlantic ocean; do they? I have never heard of a caribou trying to cross the Atlantic Ocean.

So, I believe that the caribou have turned back because of this and have gone some other way. I was also thinking and wondering if the military every considered, or if they do fly further to the southwest; if they would consider doing that, would this migration problem ever correct itself?

I would just like to have that taken into consideration. I know it is pretty hard problem to solve and maybe it would take years, if ever, if that problem would ever correct itself. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, sir, thank you very much for that contribution. It is an intriguing idea. Mr. Northcott would like to say something in response to what you said.

MR. NORTHCOTT: I was interested in hearing you describe what you did. There are a lot of theories about the caribou movement patterns and so on in Labrador.

Some people consider that a long time ago, maybe 75 or 100 years ago, that probably all of the caribou in Labrador essentially were belonging to one single herd, and this would have been before Smallwood Reservoir and so on, but that for various reasons little splinter groups came off. You have the Mealy Mountain Herd and Lac Joseph Herd and Red Wine Herd and so on.

So, after a certain period of time these general, larger migrations that you talk about stopped and the pattern which we know it now where you have the main George River Herd and a number of smaller herds came into being. Exactly what caused these splinter groups to come off, people have not agreed on what may have caused that, but there could be some substance to what you say. There could be a number of contributing factors for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We will still have a little time if anyone else would care to come up and speak. If not, then I suppose we could draw the meeting to a close. I would like to thank all of you residents of Cartwright for coming to the meeting tonight, especially those persons who have come forward and spoken to us. As I said before, all of this is going on the record and we will carefully examine this information along with everything else that we are hearing at these meetings.

If you would care to see the final form of the guidelines that we produce in December and you are not presently on our mailing list, then please see one of the members of the Secretariat to arrange for that.

I would also like, in closing, to thank the members of the Secretariat and our Audio Technician and our Court Reporter.

As I said at the beginning, this is the first series of meetings that the Panel is holding in public and there will be at least one other round of meetings and certainly if we have indications of continuing interest from the community of Cartwright, we will be sure to include this location on our itinerary the next time around. So, once again, thank you very much and good night.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 9:15 P.M., to be continued in Mary's Harbour on October 4, 1986.

Volume

6

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	MARY'S HARBOUR	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 4, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	6	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of
Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet
des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et
au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Mary's Harbour Community Hall, Mary's Harbour

DATE: October/octobre 4, 1986.

VOLUME: 6

INDEX

PAGE NO.

Introduction by The Chairman 571
Presentation by Major D. McCabe 594

SUBMISSION/QUESTIONS:

Major B. Rumboldt 611
Sandra Quigley 616
Reverend Percy Coffin 622

-o0o-

Mary's
Harbour
PM-1

---Upon commencing at 2:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. Thank you for coming out to our meeting. My name is David Barnes and I have the good fortune to be the Chairman of this group of people sitting in front of you, which we call an Environmental Assessment Panel. We have come here today to Mary's Harbour to tell you a little about this military flying project that we have been asked to review, and a little about the review itself and what it is all about, and most important of all, to listen to you.

We want to hear whatever thoughts you may have about the Project and whatever effects you think it may have on you people and your community.

Before I go on with the meeting I want to make a special point of thanking the Mayor, Mrs. Rumbolt, and the other ladies who assisted her, for providing us with a very nice lunch meal. When you are on the road for a week at a time like we are, it is really very enjoyable to get away from a restaurant and have homemade soup and homemade cookies and all that sort of thing. It is a very pleasant change.

I would like to introduce to you the other members of the Panel. First of all, a word about how we are selected, whenever the Minister of the Environment of the Government of

Canada is asked to appoint a Panel of this sort.

The staff of the office which exists mainly to support the activities of these panels, that is the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, takes a careful look at which the issues are likely to be; what are the subject that are going to have to be studied, because when we put together a Panel we try to look, at least, at the main issues and to cover those off with qualified people with certain expertise, certain backgrounds, certain knowledge. These Panels usually vary in size from four to seven people. This is one of the largest panels that we have had. So, the office looks wherever it can to find suitable candidates and these are proposed to the Minister and if he sees fit he then appoints them.

Beginning on your left, at that end of the table over there, Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier General from Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions and he was stationed in Goose Bay for a time. Mr. Stewart lives in the Ottawa area where he operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott, at my right. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has served in the past as a research biologist with the Wildlife Division with the Government of Newfoundland/Labrador. At the present time he lives in St. John's, and he is the Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and resource matters.

At my right is Mr. Tim McNeill who lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill is knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador, and in the late seventies was involved in the provincial environmental review of a proposed uranium mine in Labrador.

Next to him is Doctor Paul Wilkinson. Doctor Wilkinson is also a biologist. He has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He lives in Montreal where he operates a consulting firm. He has also been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapi Indians.

Finally, at the other end of the table is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles where he was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years before his retirement. He has also been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in commercial activities in Sept-Iles.

For the past year or so I have been employed at the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, which I mentioned earlier. I am responsible for the Atlantic Region activities of that office, and the reason that I am on the Panel is mainly that I have a knowledge of this process that we are going through.

The Panel is expected to follow certain established procedures and I am supposed to make sure that those are, in fact, followed and try to keep the whole review going along the track that it is supposed to take. Before I joined that office I was employed for about 11 years with the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in St. John's in the Environment Department.

The Panel could not function properly in all of this if it did not have several very important people assisting it. First of all, there is a Secretariat consisting of three persons, who work very hard in compiling a lot of the information for us for arranging travel, arranging meetings, generally keeping out of trouble, and I would like to introduce the three of those people to you so you will know who they are and, if necessary, make yourself known to them, either to get on our mailing list, for example, for any information you want about the Project or to receive any information about the process generally, if you would like to understand it a bit better.

First of all, the Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. Would you stand please? He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon at the back and Mr. Jim Clark.

At the side of the room, all by herself at the table, is Mrs. Munro, who is taking down everything that is said here in order to produce for us eventually an official transcript of this meeting, just as she does for all of the other meetings. I mention this because those transcripts are part of the information package that the Panel deals with and, like everything else that is available to the Panel in this review, it is a public document. Anyone can ask for and obtain a copy of the transcript of any of these public meetings that we hold.

Last, by no means least in our support staff, is Mr. Sicoli, who is our Audio Techician. He makes sure that everyone who speaks is clearly heard and that a good clear audio signal goes to Mrs. Munro so that we can record everything that is going on.

Now, the next thing I would like to do is to briefly outline this review for you so you understand how it works, where it comes from and where it is going. The historical background to all of this, the reason why this is a review, is that in 1974 the Government of Canada decided that it wanted to strengthen the planning process for any resource development projects for which the Government of Canada is responsible before the decisions are made on allowing those projects to go ahead. Another aim and a very important one was to improve and strengthen the level of public involvement and public consultation in that decision-making process.

In order to accomplish that the government established what is called the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, known for short as EARP, which is almost a little amusing for those who hear it first. Under that process whenever a department of the federal government puts forward a new project, it has to determine, first of all, by internal review within its own staff, whether or not that project needs to be put through a public environmental review such as this one.

It does so by determining answers to two questions: First of all, is the project likely to have significant effects on the environment? And, secondly, is the project likely to cause significant concern in the minds of the public? If the answer to either of those questions, or both, is yes then the department responsible must refer the project to the Minister of the Environment and ask him to appoint a panel to conduct a public review.

So, that is what happened in this case. The Project was referred to the Minister of Environment by the Department of National Defence in February of 1986. This Panel was appointed in July and given some very specific terms of reference by which it is obliged to operate, and those terms of reference have been made public, and you are welcome to have a copy if you do not already have one.

The Panel very soon sat down in private meetings and looked at quite a large body of information that had been prepared for it already by the staff of the federal assessment office, because the first task of the Panel was to determine the scope of this review, determine the issues that needed to be looked at, determine the subject matter that had to be studied. This is done in order to enable the Panel to issue instructions to the Department of National Defence, instructions that it will follow in preparing one of the key documents in this review, and that is the Environmental Impact Statement, and I will have a little more to say about that document in a few minutes.

These instructions are known in our process as guidelines. So, the Panel after its initial deliberations issued a document called the Draft Guidelines containing the thoughts and opinions of the Panel as to what the important things to be studied in this review are. That document was issued in August of this year and was immediately distributed to any of the interested parties that we knew about at the time and shortly after that we announced these meetings which we are now holding. What we want is for all interested parties to look at the draft, to examine it carefully, to think about their own concerns about this Project, their own interest in it, and to tell us whether the draft is adequate as it is or whether it needs to be modified or improved in some way.

During September and October we are in the process of visiting 17 locations in Quebec and Labrador as well as in St. John's and looking for comments from people like yourselves on how the guidelines might be improved. When the meetings are over at the end of October, we will compile all of the information coming in from these meetings, the transcripts, and information which people may give us, and around the middle of November the Panel will meet again privately and go step-by-step through the Draft Guidelines modifying them, improving them according to the advice we have been given.

Then in December, the Panel will issue to the Department of National Defence the final form of these guidelines and that final guidelines document will also be made available to the public.

The next step in the process is the actual preparation of the Environmental Impact

Statement and that will be a fairly hefty report, which will be prepared by the Department of National Defence, at its own expense, engaging whatever expertise it needs to help it, and in doing that the Department will review existing information. It may conduct some new studies that may be necessary and then write the report itself, the Environmental Impact Statement, which it expects to be able to present to this Panel sometime late in the spring or early in the summer of 1987.

As soon as the Panel receives that Environmental Impact Statement it will make it available to the public so that the Panel and the various governments involved and the public can all study that impact statement, probably during a period covering part of the summer and part of the fall of 1987.

At that time if the Panel feels that the Department of National Defence has left something out of the impact statement or has not treated a particular subject completely, it can go back to that department and ask for the presentation of additional information. When the Panel is fully satisfied that the impact statement is satisfactory, that it adheres to the guidelines, it will then announce the holding of public hearings to discuss the Project, and, as we see it now, the most likely time for those hearings to be held would be in the fall of 1987.

When those hearings are over, the Panel will again enter a series of private meetings during which it will examine what should be by that time quite a large body of information: The impact statement, the transcript of all the public meetings we will have held in the meantime, a lot of information coming from the literature that already exists, and the Panel will then prepare a report to the Government of Canada containing a discussion of the Project, a discussion of the expected impacts of the Project and possible remedies to deal with those impacts. The report will also contain recommendations concerning the various aspects of the proposal that we are reviewing, and this report is to be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence and should be ready for presentation sometime in late 1987 or early 1988.

Are there any questions about what I have said so far, before I go on?

What I would like to do next is talk a little about the guidelines, because while I understand that members of your Council have had an opportunity to see these guidelines I imagine there may be some people here who have not had that opportunity. This is what they look like. At the present time the pages number 36, and very briefly, after an introductory section the guidelines talk about the expected scope of the review, something about the methods to be used by the Department of National Defence in conducting its assessment and writing its impact statement, a list of the issues that the Panel has identified so far and then provides what could be regarded as a table of contents for the Environmental Impact Statement.

Now, I am not going to go through this page-by-page. What I intend to do is hit some of the highlights here, and if there is any particular item in here about which you would like me to say a little more, I would be quite happy to do so.

The guidelines state that they apply to the entire Project, including all activities associated with its construction, with its operation, maintenance, possible termination, and demobilization. A little later we are going to hear some of the main points of this proposal but for now let me say that the Panel has divided the Project into two components, which, by the way, is in line with the terms of reference that have been given to the Panel.

First of all, there is the low level flight training presently being carried out by several nations under special agreements between the Government of Canada and those NATO nations. Secondly, there is a proposal for the establishment and operation of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for training NATO air forces at Goose Bay which would include the establishment and operation of weapons and training ranges and all of the activities and facilities and installation associated with that.

The reason for dividing the Project into these two components has to do with the mandate of the Panel. In particular, the low level flight training that has been occurring since 1980 is expected to continue and, perhaps, to increase in the coming years. In the case of this item the Panel has been asked to recommend on the design of these activities in order to minimize any adverse effects that are being caused by them.

In the case of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre our mandate is a little different, in that we are being asked to recommend whether it should proceed or not, and, if it is to proceed, under what conditions it should be done.

Now, the Panel felt that it was very important to provide some guidance to the proponent on the approach that it should take in researching information and in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement. The overall approach that we are asking is that the area of possible side effects, or impacts, be regarded as an ecological system, or ecosytem for short, realizing that everything in this world in which we live depends on everything else. It is an inter-dependent system consisting of the air, the water, the minerals, the soil, plants, animals, and the human populations and their communities, their social and cultural structures. What we are asking for then is known in our trade as the ecosystem approach.

Within that overall approach the first thing that needs to be done is to identify which particular items in that system need to be studied; which are important to the extent that they may be affected somehow by the Project, and to the extent that they can be examined within the context of this study. So, we asked that those important items which are known within the process as valued ecosytem components, that they be identified to provide a focus for the review.

Not only that, but we expect the proponent to identify a strategy for investigating the effects of the Project on each of those identified ecosystem components.

Now to get to the issues. The Panel has to date identified nine issues, which appeared to us to be emerging from all the discussion, all the information that we have seen so far, and I would like to emphasize that we do not regard this as the final word. This we regard as a minimum list. In the process of holding these meetings, we are already becoming aware of some other issues which we may see fit to add to this list, and we think they are so important that I am going to read each of them out to now to give you an idea of what we see as these issues.

First of all, and these are not necessarily in any particular order of importance:

(1) the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife;

(2) the effects of low-level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use, and we feel that this might apply equally well to the white population of the areas being affected as to the native population;

(3) the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the Project area. Now, at the present time we really do not have any idea whether Mary's Harbour will fill any of the effects of this proposed military project, but in some of the preliminary meetings held by the staff of the office we were advised that it would be appropriate for the Panel to pay some attention to the coastal communities in this area, and Mary's Harbour was one of the communities that was identified to us to consider for visits by the Panel.

(4) the impacts of the Project on renewable resource-based commercial activities. One that is ample, we could mention, perhaps, is the

commercial outfitting of hunters, which is based on renewable resource such as the caribou.

(5) the impacts on the natural environment of:

(a) construction activities associated with expansion of Goose Bay Airport,

(b) exhaust emissions from increased flying activities;

(6) the cumulative effects of the Project and of other projects and activities going on in the region. I will say a little more about that in a moment.

(7) the need for monitoring. Monitoring being a process of watching what is going on. Monitoring which might be conducted during construction phases of the Project and monitoring that might be carried on for some time during operational phases of the Project.

(8) the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges. Sea ranges might be of some particular interest to you people in this community.

(9) the effects of the Project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. Now, the Panel is very much aware, of course, that its mandate states that the policy of the Government of Canada in dealing with Native Peoples on land claims negotiations is not

an item for deliberation by this Panel; that is, the policy. However, the subject of the outcome of negotiations under that policy and how that outcome might be affected by this Project has been brought to the Panel very forcefully as being an important issue. So, that is why we have included it in the list.

Now, we come to what might be regarded as the contents of the Environmental Impact Statement. First of all, and probably the first part of the impact statement that most people would go is to the summary. People like to get a quick overview of what is in the document.

First of all, to give you some grasp of the task that is facing this Panel, because we are dealing here with a Project that covers both parts of Labrador and the Province of Quebec, we are asking that the summary be prepared not only in English and in French but also in a sufficient number of languages and dialects to meet the needs of the following groups: the Inuit people of northern Quebec, particularly the communities of Kujjuag and Kangigsoalujjuaq, the Unuit of Labrador, the Naskapi of Quebec, the Montagnais of Schefferville and the lower north shore of Quebec, and the Naskapi-Montagnais-Innu of Labrador.

The summary is intended to bring together the important findings of the impact statement and has to be written in a manner that will allow its readers to focus immediately on the major projected impacts, the principal areas of certainty that may be left, even at that time, and other important matters, and it has to be written in terms that are understandable to the general public, especially the general public of the areas that are likely to be affected by the Project.

Following the summary then, the next important section is the setting of the Project, and first under this heading would be the justification for the Project. The Panel does not feel for a minute that it is in a position to pass judgment on the need for the Project. That after all is the responsibility of the Department of National Defence, but we do feel that it is important for the Panel to understand the reasons for the Project in order that we may be able to weigh adequately the environmental and the socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the Project.

So, we ask that this section of the Environmental Impact Statement describe the purposes of the Project and how it fits into international, national or regional treaties or plans, agreements, requirements, et cetera. We go on to say that the proponent should state whether the primary justification for the Project is a socio-economic one, or some other, and should present information in support of its arguments.

The impact statement must next discuss other projects which may be going on at the same time and which may work together with the Project in question to cause effects on the environment. First of all, the proponent will be expected to identify and describe all associated projects and activities, including ground and air-based monitoring facilities; alternate landing strips, which may be necessary; refuelling sites, and it must treat these in every respect as forming part of the Project for the purposes of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Then it must go on to discuss information on other existing or planned or probable developments within any of the areas affected by the Project in sufficient detail to permit the Panel to understand any cumulative impacts or interactions that may arise from them even if projects of that sort do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence. Examples of some that will be familiar to you would be the North Warning Radar System, the commercial caribou hunt near Nain, possible hydroelectric developments at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, and the so-called Trans-Labrador Highway.

The impact statement must document in

detail the proponent's efforts to inform himself about all known, probable and possible developments in the area affected by the Project throughout its anticipated life span.

Alternatives must also be looked at. The proponent must describe the major alternatives to the Project, including those that may already have been rejected in the planning process, in sufficient detail to allow the reader to compare and evaluate the costs, the benefits, and the environmental risks of the Project and its alternatives. These would include, for example, alternate sites for runways and infrastructure, alternative flying areas, as well as the increased use of flight simulators combined with low level flight training.

Next there must be a description of the Project itself. There was a description of the Project submitted to the Minister of Environment in February of this year as part of the referral document that I mentioned earlier. However, the Panel has identified additional information that it feels is needed almost immediately in order to fully understand the Project. Now, in fact, we will have some of that information presented to us today, but to give you some idea of what we are asking for, we are, as I said, dividing the Project into two main components.

So, we will be asking for a description

of the Project under the heading of, first of all, low level flight training under existing agreements; secondly, under the heading of the proposed NATO training centre; and thirdly, under the heading of tactical weapons ranges, which are an item that may be needed under each of the two components, under existing activity and under the NATO training centre.

I will not say anything more about the description of the Project, because, as I said, we will be hearing something about that in a few moment.

In order to predict what the effects of the Project might be on the environment, it is important to know something of what that environment is, so based on the issues which I read out to you a few moments ago the proponent is expected to document the present state of the environment as it relates to those issues. We are not asking for a total description of every possible facet of the environment because some things in the environment will not be affected by the Project at all. So, there is no need to talk about those parts of the environment.

We have to focus on the issues identified and talk about those parts of the environment which might be affected. This description of the environment must include a discussion of the aspirations, the hopes, the expectations of both the native and non-native residents of the areas of Labrador and Quebec that might be affected by the Project.

The subject headings which we have laid out in the guidelines include geology and geomorphology, climate and air quality, water quality, the flora and fauna including fish, marine mammals, birds, terrestrial land mammals, and plants.

Now, because we want everyone to understand fully that we are giving just as much emphasis to the human side of this review, to socio-economic and cultural conditions and possible effects on that part of our environment, I am going to read each of the items in the guidelines under the heading of "Socio-Economic and Resource Use Data", which, as you remember, is part of the description of the existing environment.

(1) the distribution and characteristics of the human populations, including such aspects as population trends and composition, traditional lifestyles, communities, employment, health, public facilities, and housing;

(2) the economic, cultural and social setting, including present and projected revenues without the Project; that is, as if the Project were not going to occur, including subsistence and commercial hunting, trapping and fishing,

including such activities as might be carried out in the area of proposed sea ranges, if those should become part of the Project;

(3) an evaluation of the socio-economic impacts of the low-level flight training that has been conducted since 1980, including information on employment and income derived from these activities by the local population;

(4) the historic use, existing use and projected future use of resources, including commercial hunting and fishing, subsistence activities, sport hunting and fishing, and non-consumptive tourism, which is our term for tourism involving coming and looking and enjoying the scenery and everything else that is here without removal of any of the resources;

(5) travel and communications. What is the present situation there, including air travel by subsistence hunters, by sport hunters and anglers, tourists and others;

(6) commercial aviation, including the use of air space in question in this review by international and domestic flights;

(7) a summary of aircraft movements at Goose Bay Airport in each of the last six years;

(8) areas of special status, such as ecological reserves, sanctuaries, and areas of archaeological importance, of historic importance.

(9) we would expect to see a detailed presentation of the urban development plan for the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area; and finally,

(10) in the impact statement we want to see the status of land claims negotiations involving all native groups in areas that could be affected.

That would complete the description of the existing environment. The impact statement must then go on to predict the environmental and the socio-economic impacts that are likely to occur as a result of permitting these military activities to continue and expand. That is, we would expect the proponent to predict environmental and socio-economic effects, including the effects of the alternatives that have been previously identified, and to describe these in a quantitative way, a measurable way, in terms of figures, for examples, or other measurements, and to evaluate their importance on the basis of criteria that should be set out at the beginning.

The next section after prediction of impacts would involve what are called in this process as mitigative measures, remedial measures, that would be designed to enhance or prolong beneficial effects coming from the Project as well as to eliminate or to reduce adverse effects.

This section would have to identify

very clearly who would be responsible for these individual mitigative measures, including those that might be caused by personnel or equipment belonging to a non-Canadian organization. The mitigative measures that would be implemented upon the termination of the Project or any of its parts would have to be clearly identified.

Now, having done all that, having proposed remedial measures, it is possible that even though you have done everything you can; even though the proponent or various departments of government that might be responsible have done everything that they can to offset harmful impacts, there may be some residual impacts left over, impacts for which remedial measures cannot be devised, or impacts that remain even after the successful application of such measures.

The last major section of the impact statement would deal with the subject of monitoring. I mentioned this earlier. The purpose of such monitoring would be to do one of three things: (1) to test the validity and the accuracy of the impacts that had been predicted before the Project went ahead; (2) to identify and evaluate impacts that were not or could not be predicted and just turned up afterwards; and (3) to test the effectiveness of the mitigative measures.

The section would have to describe

those measures, would have to estimate their cost, and would have to identify the agency that would be responsible for implementing the monitoring, whether it would be perhaps one or other of the departments of government or some other agency.

That is, believe it or not, a brief outline of the guidelines. Would anybody like to ask a question, just a quick question, to clarify anything that I have said? There will be an opportunity for comments and statements and questions later, and I certainly hope that you will come forward.

In the meantime we have with us an invited guest, a representative from the Department of National Defence. This has become common practice for Panels of this sort when they are holding public meetings. In order that the public and the Panel can clearly understand the nature of the Project that is under review, a representative of the proponent is invited along to make a brief presentation on the Project and to answer any questions that might come out of that presentation.

We have with us today Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence, and I think we are ready, Major, for you to make your presentation, if you would, please.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman,

Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of Mary's Harbour. I would first like to thank you for giving the opportunity to the proponent, the Department of National Defence, to briefly explain and provide more detail on the two proposals to which the Chairman earlier referred.

A little bit about my own background and my own involvement in this : I spent the first two years of my military career as an Air Traffic Controller in Goose Bay, so I certainly got to know Labrador a little bit. The last two years, or just previous to that, I did some time as a fighter pilot and, in fact, flew through Goose Bay, so I have seen that side of it as well. The last two years I have been the Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, and just this summer I have expanded my responsibilities somewhat in Ottawa to include all future developments and proposals for Goose Bay.

I am not going to go into a lot of history about Goose Bay. I would think the people along the coast, as well as the interior, are probably fairly familiar with Goose Bay. Ever since it was built in 1941 as a military air base it has seen a constant military presence, albeit at various levels of activity. In its peak years, in fact, it had nearly 12,000 military personnel and dependents living and working at

Goose Bay. Since 1980, there has been a noticeable increase in military flying in the area, specifically low level flying. With the initial interest shown at that time by the German Air Force in commencing flying operations here in Labrador, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low flying activity, which also included consideration of the requirement for practice target ranges.

This evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activity and was not intended to be an in-depth, on-site study by specialists. The evaluation concluded from that examination of material was that any detrimental effects to the environment would be generally negligible, but as the existing data on caribou and the effects of jet aircraft really was rather lacking and at times a bit contradictory a cautious approach was taken and it was recommended that a policy of avoidance of the caribou, whenever possible, be established.

In order to coordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Coordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel the Military Coordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises air crew on a daily basis of local restrictions in the area, such as caribou concentrations and active fishing or hunting camps, when these are known.

The northern training area, as you may be aware, or you can see on the map behind me later on, has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas as required. As well, known occupied camps, as I mentioned earlier, are marked on maps that the air crew use with a five-mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided during the low level trips.

In a further effort to better handle Allied military flying activity at Goose Bay Canada just this year concluded a two-year negotiation period which resulted in the signing of a multi-national Memorandum of Understanding between the Canadian Government and the other Allied users that had been using Goose Bay. This one document replaced a number of complicated agreements which had existed in the past and had been known as bilateral agreements between each Allied user and several federal departments.

Under the current agreement the Canadian Forces are the sole agent for the control of Allied military flying at Goose Bay. The Agreement provides details and information on costing of various facilities there. If they are facilities like the runway, for example, or the radar, air traffic control system, that are used by all of the parties, those are equally cost-shared, which has obvious savings as far as the Canadian government. Any facilities, which are dedicated use like quarters or hangars are paid for by the user, the total cost. As well, the Agreement limits each user to a maximum number of aircraft and personnel that can be in Goose Bay at any one time.

Any other nation wishing to train at Goose Bay in the future must become party to this same Agreement. Currently, there are four signators to the Agreement; these being the air forces of Canada, United States, Great Britain and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily involved in low level tactical flying activity. The Canadian Forces in Goose Bay maintain the long range radar at Melville and the approach control facility, the radar air traffic control, and provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft.

As well, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters on a permanent basis at Goose Bay. The United States Air Force continues its presence there, primarily supporting transport aircraft as they transit through Goose Bay on the way to Europe.

The Royal Air Force, although permitted in the Agreement to have up to 25 aircraft at one time in Goose Bay, currently maintains nine Tornado fighter bombers during the flying season, which typically runs early March to the end of October. The German Air Force is closer to its limit of 25 aircraft and they rotate between Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets.

Current operations consist primarily of tactical missions with two or up to four aircraft at a time flying at a variety of altitudes from about 800 feet down to 100 feet above the ground. Each mission entails navigation training, tactical manoeuvring, and, on occasion, delivery of inert weapons or practice weapons. These weapons are non-explosive, non-contaminant devices, which sometimes contain a small smoke charge to better indicate an impact point, and these are used on a practice target range.

Currently, there is only one such range approved for use. It is situated in the southern training area about 65 miles from Goose Bay. It is a circle eight miles in diameter and is located in an open, sandy, barren area, which has previously been burned out in a forest fire. The area is clearly marked with signs printed in English, French and two native languages.

A second proposed target area is being examined in the northern training area, but it has not received final approval at this time. Local interest groups as well as provincial authorities, such as wildlife authorities, are being consulted on this proposed site to ensure its acceptability to all concerned.

The current users have indicated a desire to gradually increase their training activity to reach the limits permitted in the Memorandum of Understanding, and this is one of the proposals that the Chairman referred to. In conjunction with this proposed increase some development of the southern practice target range, that I mentioned, that small circle, has already taken place. This includes development of a simulated runway complex and supporting facilities such as surface-to-air missile defence sites and operations centres. These facilities are constructed of basic materials such as logs and plywood and are designed to be replaceable at minimum cost as they get destroyed or damaged. There is no intention at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Flying training by the current users will continue to be oriented towards low level tactical flying and may include, in the future with the increases, some limited night flying and poor weather flying. These two activities are designed to train the air crews in the use of the terrain-following radar equipment, which is currently found in the Tornado aircraft.

As well as proposed increases by

current users other nations have recently shown interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. The Canadian Government is currently negotiating with the Government of The Netherlands to establish training facilities at Goose Bay for the Royal Netherlands Air Force. At present the Dutch hope to commence a half season training program during the summer of 1987 flying F-16 fighters. Initially 10 to 12 aircraft would be involved and about 100 personnel. No formal agreements have been signed between the two governments to date.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay, and, indeed, will be examined during the course of the study is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This Project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity.

Before I provide details of this proposal let me give a very brief background of why there is a need for this NATO training centre. Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO Air Forces in conducted over the densely populated of countries of western Europe with a concentration of activity over West Germany. To give you an example, the military sorties over West Germany annually number about 538,000, of which 110,000 are low level and that is day and night. The population of West Germany is about 63 million people.

Existing training areas, as you can imagine from those figures, are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked at the time to submit their national training requirements, and based on these statistics a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility, an ideal facility, to cater to all the training requirements. As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed.

The scope of the training centre was detailed in a Phase I Report, as it was called, and submitted to NATO in June of 1983. Two countries have since offered potential sites for location of the centre. Canada has offered Goose

Bay and the country of Turkey has offered Konya Airbase.

Site surveys were conducted of these two sites last year with Goose Bay being done in October. An initial recommendation has been submitted to NATO by the working group. NATO is expected to decide on the selection or the acceptance of the recommendation of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design would then commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design, and, obviously, anything that came out of this study would have to be taken into account.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December of 1988. During this phase if some insurmountable obstacle is encountered during the negotiations or the planning, then the alternate site would be considered for development. The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early nineties, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre Project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting up to 200 sorties a day for 20-two week detachments each year. In other words, 40 weeks of the year there would be this level of activity under the plan. As well, every two weeks there would be up to 45 sorties by transport aircraft as they came in to replace or change over personnel and replace equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and up to 1,300 ground personnel transitting through every two weeks.

These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three-year postings in the area, many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by as many as a 1,000 or 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer products stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of initial airfield facilities, such as a parallel runway and rehabilitation and possible expansion of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season in Lake Melville, or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

As far as types of training activities which might be conducted at the centre, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model, just an on-paper plan.

As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. It suffices to say that as currently proposed aircraft would partake in several training activities depending on their dedicated roles.

These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance, similar to that conducted at present; air combat training at medium to high altitudes including supersonic flight; electronic warfare training using onboard equipment and ground-based equipment; practice weapons delivery, similar to that conducted now, and they are looking for an ideal number of four ranges being required; live weapons delivery of up to three ranges, all of these being similar in size to the current range; tactical air support of maritime operations or anti-shipping, and this gets into the sea range which I will talk about in a little more detail; and last, but not least, flag-type exercises. They are referred to as flag exercises because of the type that are done in the United States and in western Canada in Cold Lake, Alberta. These involve multiple aircraft flying at one time in a variety of roles, all working together towards a common goal.

Several of these requirements that I have mentioned are desirable only. They are not mandatory for the establishment of the centre, recognizing limited factors which might prevent these activities being carried out.

This includes a sea range, that I mentioned earlier, which is merely a designated area in the ocean or over the ocean for aircraft to fire at targets towed by ships, on occasion, or, to conduct simulated attacks and tactical manoeuvring against ships, and by ships I am referring primarily to naval vessels.

Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States. Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. It has been put down as a requirement but desirable only. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile, as we call it, or, totally unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, rather than blocking off huge portions of land to public access.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges, that I mentioned earlier, technology has advanced to the stage that now there exists a capability to conduct weapons training missions against realistic targets with accurate scoring being capable without any bombs or weapons coming off the airplane. It is all done electronically.

This system is known as the "no-drop bomb scoring system", and it has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost-savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. The live weapons, particularly, cost a lot of money.

Such a system would likely be part of the NATO training centre complex, thus reducing the requirement for live weapons' ranges. Should a live weapons area be still required, however, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges, incidentally, are very closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the Project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation that I have described and also the NATO Project. With reference to the latter, only the full scope optimum facility was examined during this socio-economic study.

The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative, as any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in lower socio-economic benefits. Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase, and the regular ongoing operational phase. Of possible interest to communities other than those immediately in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area is a requirement for alternate airfields. These can take two forms. Aircraft training in any part of the world today require alternate airfields to use in case of emergency or bad weather diversion. Goose Bay, being quite isolated, is even more in need of such airfields. As well, the training scenario of the NATO training centre might require forward operating locations, as they are called, to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role.

Both of these alternate field roles would require some upgrading of local facilities, such as runway extensions, refuelling capabilities and accommodations. Potential locations being considered by the NATO working group during their examination of Goose Bay last October are Schefferville, Wabush and Churchill Falls, and from the mention of those locations, if you refer to the map behind me, you will realize that the working group has centered its plan, if you like, its survey of Goose Bay's potential on the northern training area.

The southern area would still likely see low level flying such as is currently conducted.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals that I have discussed and which have been studied to date, are based on the assumption that a full scale centre would be constructed. However, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises, and military programs are certainly not exempt from these.

As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, for your patience in giving me this opportunity to address you here today in Mary's Harbour, and, as the Chairman mentioned, I will certainly be willing to answer any questions that I can pertaining to this presentation. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. Does anyone have a question they would like to put to the Major concerning the description of the Project? If you do, I would ask you to use the microphone on the floor and to state your name before you speak. No. Very well, I am going to now call a break in the meeting and before I do I would say that anyone who is not on our mailing list for this review and who would like to be on the mailing list, or, who would like to receive a transcript of this meeting, or, who would like to have some general information on the environmental assessment review process, would you please go to one of the members of the Secretariat during the break and give your name and address and so on.

During the break I would suggest that you come forward, look at the maps, which Major McCabe has placed on the wall, speak to him, asking him anything you would like about the Project, come and speak to any of the members of the Panel. We are quite willing to speak to you informally, but I would like you to understand that anything that you would like the Panel to consider in the review should be put on the record by either giving it to us in writing or speaking into the microphone when the meeting resumes, so that it can be put on the record.

We will break now for, perhaps, 10 minutes or so and come back again after that. Thank you very much.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, to get back to the meeting I have been advised of two persons who wish to speak to us this afternoon. In the meantime, while those persons are speaking if anybody else in the audience would like to come forward and say something, please do not hesitate; that is what we are here for, to listen to your opinions and ideas, concerns.

First of all, I think we are to hear from the Mayor, Mrs. Rumbolt, and if you would be so kind as to come and sit at the table and make yourself comfortable and take as long as you wish.

---SUBMISSION BY MAYOR BARBARA RUMBOLDT:

The first question I have is to Major McCabe. What is a weapons training centre? A lot of people would basically like to know what it means.

MAJOR McCABE: The name that is given to this, a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, is merely to -- it sort of sounds fancy but basically what it entails is a facility or facilities to enable combat aircraft, primarily fighter-type aircraft, small jets and their associated equipment onboard the aircraft to practice the kind of manoeuvres that they would have to do in wartime. So, that is what we mean by fighter weapons. It applies to the whole aircraft system, and, of course, it would include, as I mentioned, weapons delivery and use of electronic equipment onboard, things like that. That is really all it is.

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: Another question: Where is the sea weapons training range going to be, and what effect would it have on the fishery?

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, as I

Rumboldt, sub.

mention again, it is a proposal, this whole thing, so during the next two years would be when the facility would actually be designed and planned and location of such things as a sea range would be determined at that time.

When the working group did its study last October, they basically looked sort of straight east from Goose Bay and drew a square on the map and that is all there was to it. There is nothing binding by that. Nobody is committed to anything that they put on maps at the time. They just looked into the feasibility of it to see whether it was reachable, within reason and that.

As I mentioned to a couple of people during the break, things like fisheries and the offshore petroleum potential, all of those things would be examined in great detail on site. It would not be somebody sitting in an office in a city somewhere else that would be doing that. There would be people here examining all of the existing data from other studies, what kind of oil exploration and gas, et cetera, that had already taken place, where they had found potential deposits, talking to the fishing industry to find out which were sensitive areas, and they would try and find something in there that would have least impact, if you like.

Rumboldt, sub.

Now, if they could not find a place, so be it.

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: What effect would this have on the coastal communities to people leaving to get jobs in Goose Bay? I do not know if that question should be directed to you or someone else.

MAJOR McCABE: What would be the effect, you say?

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: Yes, what effect it would have on the coastal communities, like the people getting jobs.

MAJOR McCABE: I suppose, really, we could look back to the peak activity period that Goose Bay has had in the past and I believe a number of communities along the coast had people go in and maintain jobs there. Details of that and how it affected the communities, of course, I am not sure. Indeed, I believe today there are still some people that work in there, and that is at sort of a reduced level of activity there, but the obvious assumption would be there would be an attraction of people in there.

Now, long term or short term, I do not know. That would really be up to the kinds of activity they might be involved with. So, I could not predict. I think it is covered in the guidelines that that is part of the socio-

Rumboldt, sub.

economic study. They would be looking at the communities and seeing what effect that would have on them.

Maybe the Chairman or someone has more to say on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Stewart would like to say something on that subject.

MR. STEWART: Not to say something; I would like to just ask a question. From this community and similar, your sister communities along here, do the young people here look to Goose Bay as a possible area of employment? Is that the direction you look, or, do you tend to look more to the Island?

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: I guess a lot of them will go up there. I mean probably a lot of the young people are concerned because right now where do you look for jobs is the problem, surrounding in these communities, so --

MR. STEWART: Looking back, say, over the last 10, 15, 20 years, has there been a lot of employment of people from this community in Goose Bay?

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: No, not really.

MR. STEWART: Certainly, I realize that people move some distances for jobs, if they are available, and that would obviously be a positive thing if unemployment was high, but I

Rumboldt, sub.

was trying to get a feel for what the pattern has been and just really where you look from this community for employment. Okay, thank you.

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: Another question: Is Mary's Harbour or any coastal community considered as a monitoring facility or refuelling site for the military or search and rescue base?

MAJOR McCABE: I have to answer in all honesty I have not heard any specific communities designated but I do know that one of the requirements for the centre, for the training centre, particularly, if they end up with offshore activity, is the establishment of a rescue launch or a rescue boat location, which, obviously, along the coast somewhere would be ideal, the closest to the designated range area. More than that, I really could not say. That sort of again hinges directly on whether there would be any activity over the water or not. It would be a requirement, though, if that were the case.

MAYOR RUMBOLDT: Thank you. I do not have any more questions right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Rumboldt. Does any other member of the Panel wish to ask Mrs. Rumboldt a question on this? No.

Our next scheduled speaker is Mrs.

Sandra Quigley. Would Mrs. Quigley like to come forward and sit at the table, please?

---SUBMISSION BY MRS SANDRA QUIGLEY:

My name is Sandra Quigley. I work with Memorial University. We have a field office here in Mary's Harbour and we work with the communities in community development.

In terms of the Environmental Assessment Review Process, I have some concerns related more, I suppose, to the process than to the particular guidelines. I think that when people are asked to participate in a process such as this, they need information in order to know what is expected of them.

The copy of the guidelines was well received when I got my copy and went through it and found a number of issues that I had not known anything about before, but I would say that the average person does not really sit down and read through 34 pages of printed material in order to think about all the impacts that are going to be considered in this kind of a process.

Perhaps, if the Panel, or, within the process there was some way of getting a short concise summary of what is expected of people in terms of the process, and then follow it with the guidelines, it may be a little more understandable to people. I know that in your requirements to the proponent you state they must provide a

Quigley. sub.

summary of the Environmental Impact Statement in the languages that are appropriate to people and in understandable language that is appropriate to people; then I would suggest that perhaps the same sort of thing could go through at this stage of the hearings, because I do not think people really had a clear idea of what was expected of them, other than you were looking for a response to a set of guidelines that perhaps they had not read and or had not really had.

So, in terms of people preparing submissions to the Panel; perhaps too, when you are thinking in terms of coastal communities, you might want to add a little more lead time because there are a lot of things going on in communities and people probably have not had time to sit down and really do up a proposal for your group. Taking into consideration, perhaps, the mails are a little slow around the coast, and if you send it out three weeks beforehand, we might get it a week beforehand.

People in communities are acting voluntarily, and they do not have any funds or anything in order to prepare things. So, you may want to keep that in mind.

The other thing, I suppose, is in terms of -- I heard on the radio the other day there were funds available for people to attend hearings if the Panel was not sitting in their community. That was the first I had heard of it, and that was about a week beforehand, so I do not know if people elsewhere also heard of it at that late date and as a result probably did not get a chance to come and talk to you.

With regard to the guidelines themselves, there has not really been a clear communication of what the ranges are all about and what kind of weapons would be used, what kind of -- I suppose your guidelines are very broad and very general -- I do not know if perhaps you might want to add things a little more specific to that. In terms of the sea ranges, as Major McCabe has already said, they do not know exactly where they are going to be, but I think that, perhaps, when you look at that in terms of your guidelines, you might want to spell out a little more the kinds of things that the proponent would have to examine. For instance, on the fishery, the salmon stocks, and the cod stocks, and how will designating a certain area off our coastline as a sea weapons training base affect the fishery in those areas will it affect shipping lanes as well and all those kinds of environmental impacts on the fish, ecologically, and on the people who move to smaller

Quigley, sub.

communities outside when they want to pursue the fishery.

That is all I have to say for now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Quigley. Perhaps, you would care to stay there for a moment, if you would at the table. I was going to respond to one item in particular.

With regard to funding assistance to people who wish to participate in the review, yes, I did say at some point in our travels that there is going to be funding available. None has been offered yet but there will be an announcement coming in the very near future giving details on the funding that will be available and the sorts of purposes for which the funding would be given to one or another of the interested groups.

I do not know exactly when that will be coming, but it will be coming quite soon, and, certainly, well in advance of the appearance of the Environmental Impact Statement, since we do not expect that until sometime next spring or summer.

The intent of the Panel is not to require the presentation of detailed information on one or other aspects of the Project at this particular time. Right now, we are attempting to define what needs to be studied and we have

Quigley, sub.

asked only for enough information on the Project to enable the Panel to try to determine what needs to be studied. The sort of information that you are asking for in fine detail would certainly be expected to be presented in the Environmental Impact Statement.

We take note of what you said about more advance notice before these meetings, and also your comment that many people might be able or interested in reading long documents. We will see what can be done about that.

We on the Panel sometimes wish we could be given more lead time for certain things we have to do too, but the situation being what it is and since there are obligations on the government to make decisions on certain things at certain times, the schedule in which we are working is what I have indicated to you, as far as we know at the present. So, we have to meet deadlines, and therefore, unfortunately, we have to impose certain deadlines on other people, but we will do our best in future to take note of your comments, and thank you very much.

MRS. QUIGLEY: There is one comment I would like to make. I know that in this particular hearing we are not going to be getting the information that I mentioned, but I was suggesting that that information be included in the parameters for the study, and that the parameters specify; not so much that you give us that information now. I know you cannot, but that the parameters be perhaps a little more specific in terms of the particulars related to the sea weapons training range.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If you would remain there for another moment, I think Major McCabe would like to say something.

MAJOR McCABE: I just thought I would add, when you asked about details of weapons, for example. We have an idea of the types of weapons that would probably be used or would want to be used on ranges that were established. A couple of reasons for leaving those out at this time is because it very quickly gets technical. We can list off all sorts of names and types of weapons, which would mean nothing to the average public, so we try and avoid that kind of detail. It is not the sense that we are trying to hide anything.

If anyone has any concerns about specific types of weapons, we would certainly be more than happy to comment on that.

MRS. QUIGLEY: I guess the major consideration would be whether or not the weapons would be live weapons, or whether they would be -- I do not know what you call them -- dummy weapons or non-explosive, but I suppose the kind of effluents coming from the materials that are being dropped and that kind of thing moreso than the specifications.

I read through the printed material on the Project and there were so many abbreviations in there that I did not have a clue what half of it meant. So, I can certainly understand when you get into technicalities it is not going to be understandable to the general public. However, there might be some way or rewording or spelling out some of those things that could make it a little bit more understandable.

MAJOR McCABE: I know there are kinds of weapons that the public generally gets very concerned about, and there are places in the world to practice with those and there are places not to, and we certainly would have our limitations on what kinds of weapons we could use.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major, and thank you, Mrs. Quigley.

We would be very happy to hear from somebody else in the audience at this point. As I say, we have come a long distance. We have planned this time here in Mary's Harbour to listen to you people, and we do have some time left in the schedule for this afternoon.

Yes, sir, come forward, please.

MR. PERCY COFFIN: Yes, sir, my name is Percy Coffin. I am the Priest in charge for the Parish of Battle Harbour, which covers about 100 miles along this coastline.

All I wanted to say is probably my own response from what I hear the people saying when I meet them in their houses and whatever, and it deals mostly with two areas: A response to a military presence, with focus on military occupation, whatever; and the other one on native rights.

The first thing I say regarding the military presence in Labrador, which is my own personal view, and which I seem to gather from the communities, is that ideally or specifically we would all like to beat our swords or aircraft into plow shares, but realistically. I think Canada has a role and a commitment, an obligation, to defend what we believe in and to act as an agent against the factors or forces which oppose our own beliefs.

Therefore, I think Canada should be all means use Goose Bay or whatever territory they see most suitable to set up such a military establishment.

The second one is regarding native rights, and this will end up being a question, but, first, I would like for someone to -- or, at least, clarify or define the word "native", because I think I am native to this area and this is our home and native land, and as for someone coming in to set up a military establishment, I think the only thing I would ask or demand of that is all respect be shown for nature and everything that it provides and for the people who live off that land, regardless whether they are aborginal or they came here a few centuries ago from Europe or wherever.

Another remark I would like to make is to have the people along the coast and in the interior of Labrador informed of the procedures and the reactions to them, have them explained in lay terms by this Panel, rather than the sometimes obscured view that we get one particular radio and T.V. station, because that goes through editing and they can give us what they want.

But, on the whole, I think while our economic and employment situation does not put us in a bargaining position, I would still like for the rights of the people, whether aborginal or just local people, to be protected and given full detailed accounts of the impacts, environmentally and otherwise, as they occur. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. I would like to respond to one point you made and that is the question of the definition of the word "native". You are not the first person this week to point out to us the importance of providing a good clear definition to that term.

Certainly, we have come to realize that there are a great many non-aboriginal residents of Labrador who do regard themselves as natives. Whether the Panel itself will be able to come up with a satisfactory definition of the term, or whether we will depend on some other party to do that, we realize the sensitivity of the subject and we will do our best to have it dealt with properly. Thank you.

Would anyone else like to speak?

One of the members of the Panel has mentioned to me that during the break somebody asked him why the Panel chose to come to Mary's Harbour, in particular. The simple answer is, that in planning these meetings we spoke to a number of people who have a good knowledge of Labrador, who have lived here for some time, who know the situation here, and we said, in terms of what the Project is and what some of its effects are likely to be which communities should we put on our list to go and actually hold public meetings.

It was felt out here on this part of the coast that Cartwright and Mary's Harbour would be, perhaps, two typical communities where there might be some spin-off economic effects at some point and where people would be interested in talking about that. So, that is the simple reason why we are here in Mary's Harbour.

I would like to give one more opportunity now before we close the meeting for anyone else here to come forward and speak. Please do not be bashful. I think you have seen by now that we are not an intimidating group of people here.

Very well, then if no one else cares to speak, I would like to thank you all for coming, thank you for making the Panel feel welcome in your community, and if we hear indications of continuing interest amongst the residents of Mary's Harbour in this Project then we will give very serious consideration to including this community in future rounds of meetings of this sort on this Project.

Before closing, I would like to thank the members of our Secretariat and our Court Reporter for today and our Audio Technician for all their assistance. Thank you very much and good afternoon everybody.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned to be resumed at 7:45 P.M., October 4, 1986 at Forteau, Labrador.

Volume

7

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	FORTEAU	ENDROIT
DATE	October 4, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	7	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Seaview Restaurant, Forteau

DATE: October 4, 1986.

VOLUME: 7

I N D E X

	PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman	627
Presentation by Major David McCabe	652

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Stelman Flynn	650
Pat Cabot	666
Tom Northcott	667
Pat Cabot	671
Stelman Flynn	682
Pat Cabot	693

* * * * *

---Upon commencing at 8:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Thank you for coming. Glad to see you here.

My name is David Barnes, and I am the Chairman of this group of people sitting before you this evening, which we call an Environmental Assessment Panel. I would like to say a few words about why we are here and what we are attempting to do.

This Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct an environmental review of proposed military flying operations over parts of Labrador and the Province of Quebec.

I should, perhaps, apologize for the short notice given for this meeting and explain that when we were making plans for this round of meetings we sat down to consider very carefully where, out of all the communities in Labrador and in the part of Quebec that might be affected by this Project, which ones we should choose for these meetings, and we sought out advice from persons we considered to be knowledgeable about the situation. Really, at that time we had heard no particular expression of interest from this part of Labrador. So, we did not include any of the communities along the Strait in our itinerary. That, perhaps, was an oversight, and when we heard some concern being expressed about this from the combined Councils, we decided that we should attempt to respond to that. Looking at our heavy itinerary for the rest of this month -- we will be going right through until the end of October with only a few days in between -- we decided that the most practical thing to do was to come down here tonight.

Now, I realize that, perhaps, a Saturday night is not the best night to hope to get people to come out to a meeting, but, really, we had very little choice and I hope you will understand. As I said, I am glad to see that you have come out.

Just a word about how people get appointed to Panels. Whenever the Minister of Environment is requested to appoint a Panel to conduct a review, the office which has been established by the government to support Panels of this sort which is called the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, located in Ottawa, looks hard at the situation, looks at what the issues are likely to be, at least the major ones, and attempts to seek out persons with appropriate background, experience, qualifications, and expertise, to deal with, at least, those major issues. The staff of that office seek a great deal of advice in doing that.

In this case a list of candidates

was put together and submitted to the Minister and resulted in the appointment of the Panel that you see before you.

I would like to introduce to you each of the other members of the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table to your left is, Mr. Don Stewart. Mr.Stewart is a retired Brigadier General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position before retirement was Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions. Mr. Stewart lives in the Ottawa area and operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott, a Newfoundlander, biologist, with extensive experience with the wildlife of Newfoundland and Labrador. For a time he was employed with the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland/ Labrador and is now the Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited in St. John's, a consulting firm in environmental and resource matters.

To my left is Mr. Tim McNeill, who lives in Makkovik, where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill is very knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador and was in 1979 involved in the provincial environmental review of the proposed uranium mine in Labrador.

Next to him is Doctor Paul Wilkinson. Doctor Wilkinson is also a biologist, who has worked extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of northern Quebec. He lives in Montreal where he operates a consultant firm, and has been involved in negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapi's.

At the other end of the table, to your right is Mr. William Jourdain, who lives in Sept-Iles. Mr. Jourdain has been quite active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and has also been involved in certain commercial enterprises in Sept-Iles. Prior to his retirement he was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years.

This Panel could not function very well if we were not supported by a team of very capable people, and I would like to introduce those people to you now. We are supported by a Secretariat of three people who are staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. The Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. Carol, would you stand, please, and identify yourself? He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon and Mr. Jim Clark. I would encourage you to get know these people during the evening if you wish to obtain some information on this Project or on the review. If you want to obtain copies of any of the publications that are available, which would help you to understand the process better, or, if you would like to get on the mailing list for all of the past and future information issued about this review, this please see either of those gentlemen this evening and provide your name and address to them.

The lady seated at the side table is Mrs. Pauline Munro, a Court Reporter, who is taking down everything that is being said here tonight. That is so she can prepare for us an official transcript of this meeting, just as somebody will be doing for all of these public meetings. Those transcripts will be available to the public as soon as they are printed and released and you have only to contact our office to get a copy of the transcript of tonight's meeting or any other one that you may be interested in.

Last, but not least, down at the table at the back is Mr. Renato Sicoli, who is our Audio Technician, and is there to make sure that everyone who speaks tonight is clearly heard through the room, and to provide a nice clear signal to Mrs. Munro to take down the proceedings.

Now, I would like to outline for you the process that we are involved in here, the review of this particular Project. First, by way of background, this review is taking place because in 1974 the Government of Canada established a process called the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, known for short as EARP.

The reason for establishing that process was to strengthen the process of planning for federally-sponsored projects and to increase the level of public information and public participation in that planning process. Before a project is entered into a public review, it is first examined by the federal department which is responsible for it to determine whether it is likely to cause significant environmental effects, or to cause concern in the minds of the public. If either of those conditions are fulfilled it is the responsibility of that department to refer the project to the Minister of the Environment and ask for a public review.

In February of 1986, the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment, described a proposal for ongoing and increased military flying activities based at Goose Bay and occurring over parts of Labrador and Quebec and asked the Minister to initiate a public environmental review.

The Minister appointed this Panel in July of this year and gave it some very specific terms of reference, which lay out the mandate of the Panel. In other words, what the Panel is supposed to examine and, to a certain extent, in what way.

The first task of the Panel, as with all Panels, was to put together a document which is called "Guidelines". This document is to serve as the instructions to the Department of National Defence, which they will use when they compile the Environmental Impact Statement for this Project, one of the central documents of the review. That impact statement will be a fairly hefty report, we expect, and will lay out certain information about the Project and its expected impacts from the point of view of the proponent; that is, National Defence. That should be remembered because it is an important point.

You might like to think of the guidelines document as a recipe. In order to get the product that you want at the end, you have to have all of the right ingredients in the recipe. If you leave out one or more of the ingredients the recipe is likely to fail, and if you try to put in too much, more than is necessary, again, you will not end up with the results that you are hoping to get.

So, in order to make sure that the guidelines documents is as good as it can be, the Panel is in the process of asking you, the public, how you feel about the Draft that we have published. That Draft was published in August of this year and it was distributed fairly widely and the main purpose of this round of public meetings that we are engaged in now is to ask for comments back on that Draft from any party who is interested in the review and is kind enough to make those comments.

We are in the process of visiting 17 locations in Quebec and Labrador and in St. John's. One of the locations in Quebec being the City of Montreal. When these meetings are over at the end of October all of the information given to us during the meetings will be compiled, all of the transcripts of these meetings will be drawn together and during November the Panel will meet privately and attempt to digest all of this and determine where the guidelines document needs to be refined, modified, improved, to make it the best possible guidelines document that we can have.

We expect to be able to present the final form of the guidelines to the Department of National Defence sometime in December of this year, and that will start the process of preparation of the impact statement by National Defence. I will have something to say in a few moments about the contents of that impact statement.

We expect that the proponent will be ready to present the impact statement to the Panel sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987. When it is delivered to the Panel, the impact statement will be made public and will go out automatically to everyone who is on our mailing list, which is why I mentioned the mailing list earlier on.

So, the impact statement will be available for study by the public, by the Panel, and by the agencies of the various governments who are interested in this Project probably during the summer and early fall of 1987.

When the Panel has thoroughly examined the impact statement and when it is satisfied that it is satisfactory, that it meets the guidelines, then the Panel will announce public hearings to discuss the Project, and these will be held in a large number of locations, depending on where the interest seems to be at that time. The most likely time for those hearings to be held is in the fall of 1987.

The last stage of the review process is the preparation of a report by the Panel itself, having examined the impact statement and all of the other various kinds of information delivered to the Panel during the course of the review. That report to the government will discuss the Project, its expected impacts, possible remedies to deal with those impacts, will contain recommendations concerning the Project, and is expected to be ready for presentation to the Minister of Environment and the Minister of

National Defence sometime late in 1987 or early in 1988.

Now, I expect there may be amongst you some people who have not had an opportunity to see this guidelines document, so in case there are I am going to briefly go through some of its important points to give you a feeling for what the Panel is intending to ask for in that impact statement, and I will not go through every page item-by-item. If you feel at any point you would like some details on what I am talking about, then stop me and I can go into some more detail. Certainly, we can provide copies of the Draft Guidelines to anybody who would like to have a copy.

After some introductory sections, the guidelines discuss the scope of the Project, the scope of the study, I should say, and the guidelines state, quite clearly, that they apply to the entire Project, including all activities associated with its construction, with its operation and maintenance, with its possible termination and demobilization.

In accordance with the nature of the Project and with the mandate that the Panel has received from the Minister of the Environment, the Panel has decided to divide the review of the Project into two components.

First of all, a review of the low

level flight training being carried out now in accordance with certain agreements between the Government of Canada and certain NATO Allies.

The other is a review of the proposed establishment and operations of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for training NATO Air Forces at Goose Bay including the establishment and operation of weapons and training ranges and all the activities and facilities and installation associated with that.

We will be hearing a little later in the evening more detail on what the Project actually consists of, but those are the two components of the Project that are being reviewed here.

The reason for the division between those two components is related to the mandate, the terms of reference of the Panel. The low level flight training has been occurring since 1980 and it is expected to continue and possibly to increase in the coming years. The Panel has been asked, in this case, to assist the proponent in designing these activities further to minimize any adverse impacts. The implication to that being that the Panel is not being invited to recommend to the government that those ongoing activities be stopped.

In the case of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, however, the mandate of the

Panel is a little different. In that case we have been asked to recommend whether or not it should proceed, and if so, under what conditions.

The next part of the guidelines document gives instructions to the proponent on the methods that should be used to carry out the study and write the impact statement. In general, we want the Department of National Defence to take what is known in the business as an ecosystem approach; that is, to consider the totality of everything that is going on in the areas that could be affected by the Project in terms of all of the interacting parts of the ecological system, including the air, the water, the minerals, the soil, the plants, animals, micro-organisms, human populations and their social and cultural structures, all of which function together to form an ecological unit.

Within that frame of reference then, the proponent is expected to identify the items which are important to be studied. We are not asking the proponent to study each and every part of that total ecological system because there are some parts of the environment which we do not expect to be affected by this Project. We are asking the proponent to focus on a set of what are known as "valued ecosystem components", and to describe a strategy for investigating the effects of the Project on each of those components of the environment. There are some other instructions there with regard to methodology but I will not get into the details of that at the moment.

So, on to the issues then to be examined. The Panel has looked carefully at all the information available to date and has compiled a list of nine issues which we feel at the present time need to be examined in this review, and, as we say in the guidelines, this need not be the final list, the total list. There may be one or more other issues which should be added to that list. So you can appreciate what this list involves. I am going to read each item.

1. the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife;

2. the effects of low-level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use, and we feel that might apply to lifestyles of white residents of Labrador just as much as to the lifestyles of natives. Just so there is no mistake.

3. the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other comunities in the Project area. Now, it may be that one or more of the communities here in this area may feel some effect coming from this Project. We do not know yet whether it will or not. If everything works right in this

system that we are involved in this study, we should know by the end whether such effects might be felt here.

4. the impacts of the Project on renewable resource-based commercial activities. The example I have been using for this is commercial outfitters for hunting parties, for example, which might be based on the caribou.

5. the impacts on the natural environment of:

(a) construction activities associated with the expansion of Goose Bay Airport,

(b) exhaust emissions from increased flying activities.

6. the cumulative effects of the Project under review and of other projects and activities in the region.

7. the need for monitoring. Now, I will say a bit more about this later but what we mean by this is monitoring that might be conducted during construction phases of the Project or that might be carried out during operational phases.

8. the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges, and

9. the effects of the Project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. I think a word of explanation might be in order here. The terms of the reference of the

Panel specify that we are not to deliberate on or reach any conclusions or make any recommendations on the policy of the Government of Canada under which it carries on negotiations with native people regarding land claims. The policy is not in question in this review. However, the Panel has come to realize that many people consider that the Project may have some effect on the outcome of negotiations being carried out under that policy, so in recognition of that concern we feel that this should be identified as an issue and this is what we have done.

So, those are the issues.

The next section of the guidelines lays out what might be regarded as a table of contents for the Environmental Impact Statement. First, and the part that most people will probably read first is the summary. The summary would normally be expected to be included at the beginning of the Environmental Impact Statement, and would also be published separately. Being a much smaller document than the entire impact statement, it could, therefore, be produced in a much larger quantity and distributed fairly widely to those persons who might be satisfied to read only the summary, for example.

Now, to give you an idea of the the size of the task which the Panel faces here in terms of the different groups that we are dealing with, we have asked that the summary section of the impact statement be produced not only in English and in French but also in a sufficient number of languages and dialects to meet the needs of the following groups: the Inuit of northern Quebec centered in the communities of Kujjuuak and Kangiqsoalujjuaq, otherwise known as Fort Chimo and George River; the Inuit of Labrador; the Naskapi of Quebec; the Montagnais of Schefferville and lower north shore of Quebec; and the Naskapi-Montagnais-Innu of Labrador. We hope we have covered the picture there.

This summary must bring together the important findings of the impact statement and must be written in such a manner as to allow readers to focus immediately on the major projected impacts, the principal areas of uncertainty that may remain at that time and other important matters and it must be written in terms understandable to the general public, particularly the general public of the areas likely to be affected by the Project.

As for the rest of the impact statement, it must open with a description of the setting in which the Project is going to be developed. There must be a justification of the Project. Now, I should explain that the Panel does not feel for a minute that it is mandated to pass judgment on the need for the Project. That is the responsiblity of the Department of National Defence, but we feel it is important for the Panel to understand the reasons for the Project in order to be able to weigh adequately the environmental and socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the Project. So, we will need to see in the impact statement the purposes of the Project and how it fits into international, national or regional treaties, plans, et cetera, et cetera.

The proponent is expected to state whether the primary justification for the Project is socio-economic or some other, and should present information in support of his arguments. The impact statement must discuss the projects under review in conjunction with other projects. First of all, the proponent should identify and describe all associated projects and activities including ground and air-based monitoring facilities, alternate landing strips, refuelling sites and should regard all of this as forming part of the Project for the purposes of the impact statement.

Then, there is a need for information on other existing planned or probable developments within any of the areas affected by the Project, and these must be presented in sufficient detail to permit the Panel to understand any cumulative impacts or interactions that may arise from them, even if such projects do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence. We are talking about such projects as, for example, the North Warning Radar system or the commercial caribou hunt near Nain, possible hydroelectric development at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, and the Trans-Labrador Highway.

The impact statement must document in detail the proponent's efforts to inform himself about all known probable and possible developments in the area affected by the Project throughout the anticipated lifespan of the Project.

It is very important that the review consider alternatives to the Project under review. The proponent will be expected to describe the major alternatives to the Project,including those that may have already been rejected by the proponent in the planning process and to present these in sufficient detail to allow the reader to compare and evaluate the costs, the benefits, and the environmental risks of the Project and its alternatives.

Next, we expect to see a Project description. Such a description already exists. It was conveyed to the Minister of the Environment as part of the referral document which I spoke about earlier. However, in looking at that and in listening to some of the interested parties, the Panel has identified a need for additional information which needs to be presented early in the review in order to fully understand the Project, and it is important that both the Panel and the public have a full understanding of the Project.

The proponent has already been invited in writing to supply this additional information, and, indeed, we will hear some of that information this evening as part of a brief description of the Project.

The description of the Project and the information needed to make up that description is laid out in the guidelines under three headings. First of all, there must be Project information provided under the heading of low level flight training under international agreements between Canada and the various NATO partners that are currently involved in those activities.

Secondly, descriptive information must be presented on the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre.

Thirdly, we require information concerning the tactical weapons ranges, which form a part of the ongoing activities and also the proposal for the training centre.

Having described the Project then, the proponent is expected to describe the existing environment into which the Project will be set. Now, I read out to you the issues which the Panel has identified. We are asking the proponent to set out on the basis of those issues, the present state of the environment. As I said before, we are not looking for a study of the entire environmental setting. We want the proponent to focus on the issues and to study those parts of the environment related to those issues.

This description of the environment must include a survey of the aspirations, the expectations of both the native and non-native residents of Labrador and the parts of Quebec that are expected to be affected. We are stating in the guidelines that that information should be presented under certain headings and the suggested headings are as follows: geology, climate, air quality, water quality, flora and fauna, including fish, marine mammals, birds, terrestrial mammals and plants.

At least as important as the natural environment, as we may all think of it, is the socio-economic environment that is to be considered here, and because this is so important and because we want you to understand that we are, at least, as concerned about that socio-economic environment, I am going to read for you each of the items that we have laid out under this heading.

First of all, the proponent is expected to describe the distribution and characteristics of the human populations, including population trends, composition, traditional lifestyles, communities, employment, health, public facilities and housing.

Next, the economic, cultural and social setting, including the present and projected revenues in the absence of the Project, and projected revenues as they might be expected to occur if the Project did not occur. This to include subsistence and commercial hunting, tracking and fishing, including such activities in the area of proposed sea ranges.

Third, an evaluation of the socio-economic impacts of the low level flight training since 1980, including information on employment and income derived from those activities by the local population.

Number four, historic, existing and projected future resources including commercial hunting and fishing, subsistence activities, sport hunting and fishing and non-consumptive tourism.

Travel and communications including air travel by subsistence hunters, sport hunters and anglers, tourists and other people.

Commercial aviation, including the use of airspace in question by international and domestic flights. A summary of aircraft movements at Goose Bay airport in each of the last six years relating to the time period during which the low level flying has been occurring.

Also, to be considered are areas of special status, such as ecological reserves, sanctuaries, areas of archeological importance, historic importance, et cetera. We need to have a full understanding of the urban development plan for the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, and we need to know the status of land claims negotiations involving all native groups, for reasons that I have already stated.

Now, comes, perhaps, the most important part of the impact statement; that is, predicting the environmental and socio-economic impacts. We are saying that the expected environmental and socio-economic effects of the Project, including the alternatives identified in previous sections, should be described quanitatively where possible; that is, using measurements of some kind and evaluated as to their importance on the basis of criteria which are established early on in the document.

After describing the expected impacts the proponent will then be expected to discuss what are known in the trade as mitigative measures, remedial measures, measures designed to enhance or prolong beneficial effects of the Project, as well as those designed to eliminate or reduce adverse effects.

The Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, should identify clearly who will be responsible for individual mitigative measures, including those which are designed to deal with effects caused by personnel or equipment belonging to non-Canadian organizations. Mechanisms for mitigative measures should be detailed, particularly with reference to activities involving other countries. The mitigative measures that will be implemented upon the termination of the Project, or, any of its elements must be clearly identified.

The next section of the impact statement must deal with residual impacts. These are the impacts for which mitigating measures cannot be devised, or impacts that will remain after the successful application of mitigating measures. The significance of the residual impacts should be established on the basis of the same criteria used earlier in the study.

The last important section of the impact statement deals with a monitoring system. I mentioned monitoring before. The expectation here is that there is going to be a need for ongoing monitoring, ongoing watching of the Project during construction and operation. The purpose being, first of all, to test the validity and the accuracy of the impacts predicted in this review.

Secondly, to identify and evaluate impacts that were not predicted or could not be predicted and have turned up only after the Project has been approved and is in construction or operation.

Finally, the purpose of monitoring is to test the effectiveness of the mitigating measures, the implication being that if those measures are not working then, perhaps, they need to be improved.

The section on monitoring, therefore, must describe the activities to be done in the monitoring program, to project their expected cost and to identify the responsibility for a program of monitoring design to achieve those purposes. Some of the monitoring, for example, might be the responsibility of a particular department of the government; some might even be the responsibility of the Department of National Defence.

There, in sort of capsule form, is the table of contents for the impact statement, forming a major part of the guidelines.

Perhaps this is a good point to ask if there are questions in what I have said so far? If you have a question, I would ask you to stand up and use the microphone on the floor and identify yourself for the record.

MR. STELMAN FLYNN: Stelman Flynn, Vice-President of South Labrador Development Association. Just one question, when you were going down through these guidelines it struck me: If we identified five or six, which we feel, important issues that may affect this area here tonight, are there any guarantees that any of them will be taken seriously and looked at by the next Panel or your Panel or whatever, or, is what we are going through sort of an exercise here?

THE CHAIRMAN: If your suggestions relate to this Project, then we guarantee they will be very seriously considered. You might find that by the time they get into the guidelines they may have changed somewhat in their form but, if the Panel agrees with you that these, indeed, are issues important to this area and important to the review, then there is an excellent chance that they will turn up in the final form of the guidelines.

Would anybody else like to ask a question on the guidelines or the process?

All right, if not, then we will go on to the next part of the meeting.

It is customary whenever a Panel like this is holding a public meeting to invite along a representative of the proponent in order to present information on the Project so that we can feel sure that the Panel and the public understand just what is the Project that is under review, and also to respond to any questions from the public about that description of the Project.

So, in accordance with that custom, we have invited here tonight Major David McCabe, of the Department of National Defence, and I would ask him to stand, please? He stands out fairly well in that uniform anyway, and if you are ready, Major, would you go to the table and make your presentation, please.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of Forteau and the surrounding communities.

Because of the hour tonight I am going to try my best to shorten this or make it as brief as possible, and if I do find, or if you find some area that you want more detail on that maybe I have glossed over too much, please bring it to my attention later. I do want to try and keep it short so we have maximum time for questions, et cetera.

I am currently the Desk Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre Project in National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa, and, as well as that particular responsibility, I look after general development plans and proposals for Goose Bay.

Goose Bay, as I am sure many of you know, since its establishment in 1941, has seen a constant presence by the military albeit at various levels of activity. At the peak years there were in fact close to 12,000 military personnel and their dependents or families living in the area. Since 1980 there started to be a noticeable increase in military activity in Goose Bay and that took the form of Allied, as we refer to them, Nations conducting low level flying activities over the Labrador and Quebec interior. At present we have an agreement in place which we have signed this year after two years of preparation. There are four signators, four countries, who are party to this agreement. It is a multi-national Memorandum of Understanding. These countries are Canada, United States, Great Britain and West Germany. These latter two countries are primarily engaged in low level flying activity, flying training, out of Goose Bay. The Canadian Forces in its presence in Goose Bay supports the long range facility at Melville, which has been there for many years; also, supports and operates the Air Traffic Control and Radar Facility at the airfield and since March of this year the Canadian Forces has established a permanent base rescue flight of three rescue helicopters. In previous times there were rescue helicopters during the summer season, and now we have them there year round.

There is a small section of the Canadian Forces establishment there which looks after servicing transient aircraft, transport and fighter aircraft, of the Canadian Forces that are going through Goose Bay either to or from Europe.

The United States, which has really always had a presence at Goose Bay, today has a very small contingent which primarily looks after the servicing of their transient transport aircraft as they go over to Europe.

Two years ago, recognizing a need to better control the increased flying activity, the Canadian Forces established a Military Coordination Centre. It is manned by Canadian Forces personnel and its primary responsibility is to coordinate and control all local military flying activity. On a daily basis, air crews come in and file flight plans and at that time they are advised of any local restrictions in the area where they will be flying, such as caribou migrations; if it is the calving season areas that are used by the caribou for calving are, in actual fact, sectioned off and are not permitted to be used by the low flying aircraft; any known fishing or hunting camps that are occupied at the time are indicated on the air crew's maps by putting a five-mile circle around these as areas to be avoided by the aircraft. The obvious purpose of that is to ensure that there is minimum disturbance to the people who are out there.

The Chairman has mentioned two proposals that the Canadian Forces has put forth, and I must emphase these are not -- I should say the Department of National Defence rather than the Canadian Forces, because these proposals are not specifically for the Canadian Forces. We would be involved in the operation of them and sort of the coordination, but they both involve air forces of Allied Nations, or, in actual fact, NATO Nations.

One of them is the proposed expansion of the current activity. Under the Agreement I mentioned earlier the countries are limited to a certain number of aircraft; normally about 25, and a maximum number of personnel that can be in Goose Bay at any one time. At present the Royal Air Force from Great Britain only are using about nine Tornados during the flying season which runs typically from about the beginning of March to about the end of October. The Germans are somewhat closer to their maximum limit and they use three types of aircraft generally: Tornados, Phantoms and Alpha Jets.

Now, both of these nations have indicated a desire to go up to the maximum or as close to it as possible, and possibly even extend the flying season somewhat. As well, we have had indications from other nations who have seen the activity that is going on there and hearing about the flying that is available, and have indicated their interest at this stage in conducting flying activities there. Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of The Netherlands, or Holland, to establish flying facilities for The Royal Netherlands Air Force. The Dutch, in fact, conducted a short trial detachment this past summer in conjunction with some elements of the Belgian Air Force. The Royal Netherlands Air Force next year in the flying season of 1987 hope to have about one-half season training period. They will have about 10-12 F-16 fighters and will be again concentrating on low level flying.

The users of the airfield, of the facilities there, obviously require facilities such as barracks and hangars, quarters for married personnel. These facilities are what we call dedicated use and the users pay 100 per cent for those. That is covered under the Agreement I mentioned earlier. The Agreement also covers such things as we call common use items, which all the signators to the Agreement share equally in: Such things as the runways, the air traffic control facilities, et cetera. Everyone pays an equal share. That has obvious advantages to the Canadian Government; rather than paying 100 per cent for the facilities of the airport we are currently paying 25 per cent.

I mentioned the low level flying and the type of things they do is low level navigation and tactical manoeuvring in that low level environment, and low level we really define as between 800 feet down as low as 100 feet above the ground in designated areas. This is a very trying and difficult experience for the air crews, and, in fact, in Europe these areas are very limited.

I gave an example earlier today. All of the Allied Nations must do low level flying and, indeed, all sorts of flying, which I will talk about in a little bit. The country of West Germany, which all the nations tend to do flying in, has about 538,000 sorties a year, military flights, of which 110,000 are in that low level regime that I talked about. When you consider all of those are over a country of 63 million people, you can understand some of the problems with trying to find areas where people are not bothered and where there are suitable facilities to train.

This difficulty in getting suitable training facilities has resulted in national shortfalls in the annual training. This, obviously, has a detrimental on the capability, the combat capability, and efficiency of the air crews.

The NATO centre, and this kind of requirement that I have just spoken about is what has led up to the feasibility study of the centre. The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is a fancy name for a facility which would provide, hopefully, all aspects of training for fighter-type aircraft: Jet aircraft. That is what they really mean by fighter weapons. It is the aircraft and the weapons' systems associated with them.

To give you a little detail on the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, and

I must emphasize here that we are talking about a proposal, one of the proposals earlier is really a project which exists but we want to expand it. The other one is a proposal which exists on paper; a feasibility study was done; all the nations were asked for: What are your training requirements; all of this was lumped together and a basic concept was created, if you like.

Now, at the time this was done a working group was appointed to do all of this study and they were advised at the time that cost was not to be a constraint. Therefore, they went at this with much enthusiasm and have come up with what we call a Phase I Report in which they have defined a large-scale, full-scope facility.

Some statistics associated with this facility and its operation are as follows: The facility would see about 136 aircraft in place conducting up to 200 sorties a day in two-week detachments and there would be about 20 of this year. So we are looking at about a 40-week operating period during each year.

These aircraft would involve every two weeks a maximum of 370 aircrew and up to 1,300 ground personnel who would come through and train for two weeks and then be changed over and replaced by an equal number or up to that number from other bases in Europe. These activities and these people would be supported at the base by up to 1,700 personnel, and this would be multi-national. They would be at the base for two or three year postings and as such the married people involved would probably bring their families along, so you have a further increase of maybe a 1,000-1,500 people. In an area of 7,200-7,500 hundred you can imagine all of this together is a significant increase, but it does not come really even close to what it used to be in the peak years.

To give you a better idea of the sort of activities and I guess this is really the area of concern and possibly the least information is, what sort of activities does one do in a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre?

One of the first things would be similar types of things as are done right now; that is, low level navigation and reconnissance training. There would be a requirement for electronic warfare facilities and, really, all that involves is the use of electronic equipment on the aircraft in association with electronic ground-based equipment. This is just a modern technology thing part of warfare which requires certain kinds of facilities to work with. There would be a requirement for practice weapons ranges.

At present we have one that is

licensed, if you like. Just to give you a brief idea, it is fairly small. It is eight miles in diameter and this summer they constructed a simulated airfield complex in the middle of that with some associated buildings made of logs and plywood, et cetera, to use as targets.

Now, a practice target range only inert weapons, as we call them, or practice weapons are used. That is, they are weapons that look like bombs but they are non-explosive and non-contaminant; basically, a lump of steel or concrete in actual fact in some cases. Some of these have a small smoke charge in them that is just a spotting device to show impact on the ground. The NATO Centre needs in the optimum, if you like, up to four those ranges.

They also have indicated a requirement for up to three live weapons ranges, and here we are talking live weapons, explosives, real weapons, but what we call conventional weapons, as opposed to such things as chemicals or nuclear. It is strictly the normal type of weapons that have been around for a long, long time. I can get into more detail on that, if need be.

As well, there would be a requirement, the Chairman mentioned, a sea range. We call this tactical air support of maritime operations; that is, aircraft which assist or go against shipping and, again, we are talking about destroyers and things like that. Now, a sea range is really just an area where some air-to-sea firing can take place; again, they use practice weapons and they shoot at a target that is pulled by a ship. These kinds of ranges are nothing new. We have several of them off the coasts of Canada and United States on both east and west coasts and there are several in Europe which are used. They are not used on a regular basis. They are used infrequently, and when they are used lots of advance notice is given to mariners, fishermen, et cetera, and, in fact, to civil aviation.

That sea range, as another type that I will mention in a minute, is what we call a desirable item according to the definition of the scope of this thing. It is not a mandatory thing. If it is not possible to establish such a range because of restrictions, say from fishing or whatever might be in the area, then it would not be established. Another one is what they call an air-to-air gunnery range. The problem with this kind of range is that the area underneath, if it is over land, has to be sterile in the sense of no people living underneath or even using underneath. As that could be a bit of a problem, obviously that would involve restricting land to hunters, et cetera, which is not a desirable item, this would probably have to be established once again over the sea, and it, again, is a desirable item. There is a possibility that would not be established.

At the airfield itself, as you can imagine from the number of personnel and aircraft that I spoke about, there would be a requirement for considerable construction, if you like. Such things as barracks, married quarters, hangars, aircraft maintenance shops, recreational facilities, operations centres and consumer products stores would all be required in the area. As well, in the initial construction phase there would be such things as upgrading of airfield facilities, such as construction of a parallel runway and upgrading and expansion, possibly, of the fuel storage and delivery system. As well, a regular re-supply system would have to be established into the area. That might involve extension of the shipping season in the Lake Melville area, or possibly an expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system.

I did mention a requirement for live weapons ranges. When this study was initially started in 1981, or since that time, technology has advanced to the point that there now exists an electronic system, which is carried onboard the aircraft and it uses ground-based facilities something similar to microwave towers which enables aircraft to carry out a full tactical mission against a target on the ground, including scoring of attack on that target without anything coming off the aircraft; that is, no weapons at all come off the aircraft. This has obvious advantages: Protection of the environment and considerable cost-savings by reduction of ordinance or weapons expenditures. Even with the implication such as I just mentioned, which we call a "no-drop bomb scoring system", and I fully believe that that will be part of the complex, there may still be a requirement for a live weapons range.

Again, we have these in several places in Canada and I will say that they are very strictly controlled. There are very stringent criteria for the establishment of these areas, and they are, on a regular basis, cleaned up; that is, if there is any unexploded material in there it is all taken care of so there is no danger to animals or people who might be around.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a Project, and again the Chairman discussed this a little bit, are obviously directly proportional to the scope of the Project. The Department of National Defence is just completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and also the NATO Project. With reference to the latter, this study looked at the full scope Project as has been defined by NATO. As such, I must warn that the results, the data, are high speculative. They are based on, as I say, a full optimum facility. Any downsizing of the scope of that facility obviously would result in proportionately lower or reduced socio-economic benefits. That is not to suggest that there would not be any.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular ongoing operational phase. Of some interest to communities other than the Goose Bay-Happy Valley community and its immediate neighbours, there is a requirement for alternate airfields. Now, an alternate airfield can be required for two things. In normal operations for any kind of aviation if an aircraft has an emergency or runs into bad weather at its home station, then it needs to be able to go somewhere else. Goose Bay, being very isolated as it is, has quite a need for such airfields to be able to handle military traffic. That would require an expansion, or extension, if you like, of runways, possible upgrading of refuelling facilities and maybe even some accommodations. Another use for these fields, depending on the training scenario of the NATO Project, would be to use these locations as a forward-operating location where a very small number of aircraft would be launched to serve in an adversary or opposition role.

When the working group was in Goose Bay last year, last October, to do a site survey of the facilities and of the potential of Goose Bay and the interior, they concentrated their study, if you like, primarily on the north training area, which I have on the map here, both areas, and we can look at them during a break.

Because of that, the areas they are considering for alternate airfields are Schefferville, Wabush and Churchill Falls. That would not be necessarily all of them but those are some of the options. The southern training areas that exist right now would still continue to see primarily low level military flying activities.

In conclusion, I, again, want to emphasize that the expansion proposals, that I have been discussing and that will be studied during this environmental assessment review, are based on the assumption that a full-scale centre would be constructed. However, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military projects such as we are considering here are certainly not exempt.

As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and

ladies and gentlemen. I would certainly be glad at this time to discuss anything in further detail about my presentation or to answer any questions of clarification that you might have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. Would anyone like to ask a question concerning the Project? Yes, sir, would you give us your name for the record.

MR. PAT CABOT: Pat Cabot, Major, Major McCabe, I was wondering you mentioned about designated areas where this aircrew would fly down to 100 feet and you mentioned the test bombing areas, designated areas, I wonder how the public would be notified about these areas before that sort of thing happened, which areas they would be?

MAJOR McCABE: As a matter of fact, those exist right now and have for a couple of years. I have them marked on the map up here, which people can look at. They are marked. Particularly from an aviation point of view, they are published. There is certainly nothing restrictive about them. A lot of people are under the impression that where they see these on aviation charts and in certain publications, the way they are marked out might be suggested that people are not allowed in there, or aircraft are not allowed in there. That is not the case at all.

The only restrictions that apply

there are to military pilots; that is, it is only within that area that they can do this low level flying. Outside of those areas, in uncontrolled airspace and away from any kind of communities they can go down as low as 250 feet, and that occurs anywhere across Canada in that kind of terrain. So, they do exist already.

The practice weapons range has been licenced since October of last year. It is about 65 miles from Goose Bay, and, again, I have that marked on the map there. That area, incidentially, is in a very sandy open area that has previously burned out by a forest fire. It was very closely examined to make sure that it was not used by hunters and really had no value at all. It is sign posted in English, French and two native languages and, again, suggesting that people do not go into the area because of the danger there. Actually, as you will see on the map, it is quite a small area. Does that help any?

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else like to ask a question? If not then, I am going to call for -- oh, excuse me, Mr. Northcott would like to say something.

MR. NORTHCOTT: I was just wondering, do the NATO personnel visiting Goose Bay have sufficient free time to visit other places in Labrador, the Straits, for example?

MAJOR McCABE: I think from my

experience with these people, the people that come over for the two or three-week detachments, really, to date have not had a lot of time to come to explore Labrador and the communities on the coast. However, there are even today support personnel from these nations who live there year round. A know a number of people have done some travelling in Labrador. They have certainly taken part and thoroughly enjoyed the hunting and fishing opportunities, because those kind of things are a rare thing, indeed, in Europe. They also do a lot of travelling to other parts of Canada and the United States.

So, coming down to the Straits, I do not know. I have not spoken to any people that might have come down but I know they certainly are made aware by ourselves that live up there, that are posted from a military point of view, and also the residents up there about all the benefits that do exist and the interesting places to see.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, would come forward, please.

MR. CABOT: Major, I was wondering, for example, if my son was out in a certain country training or anybody's son, and I am thinking about the relatives back home that would be taking a holiday and they might want to go and look at the area where their sons and daughters and what-have-you are training. I was wondering have you thought about that and what kind of an influx of people would that bring? How would that help maybe our tourist industry and, obviously, people would have to be fed.

MAJOR McCABE: That is an interesting thing which I know to date in our hearings has not come up. I think it has been considered in another sense. Development in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area, I mentioned some of the things that would be needed to be constructed in direct support of flying there.

Obviously, any kind of expansion of this size is going to have a lot of spin-off effects; businesses associated in support of that or indirectly with that. Civilian aviation is already on the increase up there, due partly to military increases and I, indeed, think that would continue.

I know the local residents up there have been for some time trying to encourage a tourist industry, so that is why I say it has been thought of in a sense. There is no doubt in my mind that particularly the support personnel that come over and are posted for two or three years, those are the sort of people whose families would, I think, come over and visit them. I know, in fact, that has happened in the past. So, indeed, that would increase the visitors to the area and, hopefully, the local community would foresee the requirements and there would be an increase in facilities to cater to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions at the moment? Very well, thank you very much, Major.

During the break that I am about to call I suggest that you take the opportunity to come over and look at the two maps that are here this evening, one on one wall, a map of Labrador, showing the zones that the Major has been speaking about; the one on the other side showing the Goose Bay airfield. There are refreshments on the table over at the side, juice and coffee. Come forward, look at the maps, speak to Major McCabe, speak to any of the members of the Panel, if you wish, and one thing I would ask you, if you would like to speak this evening, would you, please, go to Mr. Jim Clark -- would you wave your hand again, Jim, to make sure they know you -- go to Jim and give him your name and the name of the organization that you represent, if that is the case, so that by the end of the break we can see how many people we have who wish to speak, how much time we have left, and how we can fairly allocate the time.

Thank you very much. We will break for about 10-15 minutes.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Now, it is time to hear from you and it has been indicated to me that we have two people who wish to speak. First, in line is Mayor Pat Cabot. Please, would you like to sit at the table and make yourself comfortable and tell us what you have to say.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. PAT CABOT:

Mr. Chairman, Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen.

First, you will have to excuse me because we are all so green on this Project and particularly on the Panel itself. Now, we certainly, in my opinion, accept, Mr. President, your brief apologies at the beginning, for practically leaving us out of this whole process. I wrote in and obtained, a couple of days ago I got a copy of it and I looked at all the communities that was listed for the meetings and I saw the Labrador Straits was not in it, and that same day we just heard about it just prior to that, a few hours prior to that.

Yesterday I got my hands on a copy of the terms of reference and there are very few, if anybody, around -- not many; a few people connected to Southern Labrador Development Association, which is a regional association for the area representing the communities from Red Bay to L'Anse

Cabot, sub.

au Clair, that covers approximately between 2,000-3,000 people, somewhere around 2,500-2,600.

I looked on your terms of reference and on the Project itself and it said it was covering 100,000 kilometres, and I said, surely, you know, how could we have been left out of this, something -- or a process or an activity that was taking place practically on our door steps, and for sure there was going to be effects both ways, hopefully, some positive effects, and we know there are going to be some negative effects if we speak from our community point of view.

But, first, let me inform you people where we are coming from. My grandchildren is the sixth generation since our people came over. Now, that varies some and there are some here with seven or eight or maybe nine generations, but my grandchildren are the sixth generation. My grandfather, his people came over and when he grew up here he did not know there was a government, and my grandmother lived much longer and I think she got something like $15.00 from the government every three months, quarterly.

The point I am making here is how much our people depend on the natural resources of the land and the sea to live entirely, absolutely entirely. Now, that has gone down somewhat but the thing that astonishes we people is that after these years and these numbers of

Cabot, sub.

generations, it still does not appear that we have a voice.

Now, Labrador is not an area where there is a great population of people and I mean 3,000 people here in the Straits area, a couple of hundred miles from where the activity is taking place itself, we are certainly going to be covered in it.

We feel we have not been given the opportunity to have advice in a process to study an activity that is already in progress and is certainly on our doorsteps. This will, no doubt, have some negative effects on our communities and the environment, in general.

I am wondering and I guess our communities are who on your Panel will be our advice, who is our advice, when you have your meetings in other centres like St. John's, Quebec, and these far away places from the actual activity itself. Seventy-five per cent of our people's livelihood come from the natural resources around: The sea and the land; their earnings come from the sea and land.

Because we live in an environment where our seasonable employment is short, we do not get the full year, it is seasonal -- our fishermen they have x number of months; our fur trappers have x number of months and so on -- that we have to depend on our governments for a certain

Cabot, sub.

period of the year, quite a lot of our people, and I understand it is a black word in Ottawa but it is certainly almost a life or death situation to we people in this part of the country. Unemployment insurance probably make up the rest.

I know it has gone down a lot since my grandfather and my father, but I know in my particular family, in our family, 60 per cent of our food is gotten locally from the sea and from the land; practically all our meats from birds and caribou and whatever we can get. Now, unfortunately, we have lost our caribou herd back some years ago, and we have not been able to get any since. We have to go, I think it is something like 400 miles now when they come to their closest point, and even though Labrador has the largest herd in North America.

Now, if this activity, in our opinion, drives them caribou 50 miles north from where they are now it does not mean anything to us, but if they drive them 250 miles south we would welcome, we think that would be an improvement.

Therefore, looking at the situation and the way we people live and the way our people, our generations, lived down through the years, we are very much concerned on the effects that this training activity will have on the environment and particularly on the wildlife and not especially on the caribou like I think is mentioned somewhere

Cabot, sub.

in your terms of reference or in your guidelines, a mention especially on the caribou. There are a whole variety that we have out there: All the fur bearing animals; the birds, in particular, we all share into them, we all get a part of them. It is a great asset to our livelihood. People look to that certain times of the year.

Let me say that we here in this part of Labrador, in the most southern extreme part of it, are certainly not against the low level training that is taking place at Goose Bay, or that matter the training centre itself, but I think we would welcome a Project of that nature particularly if the negative effects on us, the most greatest negative effects would be the drain of some of our human resources from our communities.

Now, that would be a two-way street in the sense it is good for the individual to get a job, but if we live in a community with 100 families to pay their poll tax or their property tax and you lose 10 of these families, then it hurts the community itself. So, it is a negative effect on the community, but it is certainly a positive one to the individual.

We also believe that for countries not to have a trained military would be like going outside in Labrador in the wintertime with no clothing on; it would be detrimental.

Cabot, sub.

But we know where any activity takes place, there has to be negative effects and there must be positive ones as well.

I think our concerns here are certainly not forgetting about what ill effects it will have on the environment and on the whole ecological system, but to see what good is into it. How can we benefit from such a Project? How can our tourist industry benefit from it? How can our fishery, our fishermen, our communities benefit from it?

Obviously, people eat different species of fish and we would be certainly interested in this area to know what sort of demands -- if there would be demands for speciality products, or, we know it would not be 10,000 pounds of cod fillets today and tomorrow and so on, but whatever the case may be, we do not have large communities and a cottage industry sort-of-thing would fit right in there.

We have a lot of craft people who have traditionally -- it has been handed down to them -- who make handmade things, all sorts of things such as footwear, boots, hats, souvenirs, clothing and all that. How could this Project help this people? What kind of a demand would there be for crafts? What kind of craft?

Maybe a lot of this, perhaps, is

Cabot, sub.

outside of the whole thing. You know, we are ignorant to the thing in a sense that just the bit of information we got here tonight, but I think these are our concerns, are some of our concerns. I am sure that if we had had time to be able to call together a meeting of our community, there would have been a whole variety of concerns.

I would like to thank the commission, finally, for coming here and giving us an opportunity to have a word, to have our concerns included; we hope they will be included, and we hope the concerns of all our areas around us will be included in your study. Thanks very much. If you have any questions of any kind to ask me, you are free to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Cabot. I was going to ask you if you would kindly wait there a moment.

There were a couple of things that I would like to say in response to what you have said. First of all, I hope that everyone here understands that we are at a very early stage in the process. We have not gone two-thirds or three-quarters of the way in the process without coming out and meeting people. I do not believe that you have really lost any opportunity to become involved in the process, if that is what

Cabot, sub.

you wish to do. Even with regard to expressing concerns that you would like to see included in the guidelines, tonight is not your only opportunity. If you wish to hold meetings amongst yourselves here and if you wish to write something to us, we would be glad to receive anything up to the end of October, and if you wish, you can get the address of the Executive Secretary by speaking to him. He would be glad to hear from you.

Another point I would like to make is, that when a Panel like this is formed, it is not the intention of having a member of a Panel to represent a certain group of people, a certain town or a certain region. The intention is to have people on the Panel who have knowledge of certain subjects. So, it is not really a question, I do not think, of having a person on the Panel to represent the communities of the Straits area here any more than we have somebody to represent the community of Happy Valley-Goose Bay or the community of Schefferville, all of which are within areas that could feel effects of the Project.

MR. CABOT: Why I mentioned that, Mr. Chairman, is on page six, paragraph (f): "The rights and interests of non-native people, whatever they may be".

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this the guidelines document that you are looking at?

Cabot, sub.

MR. CABOT: That is the review process reporting -- okay, "Guiding Principles".

THE CHAIRMAN: You are looking at the terms of reference.

MR. CABOT: Terms of reference, that is the only thing we have.

THE CHAIRMAN: I had understood that the Draft Guidelines document had been distributed to certain people in the area, but that is quite all right. Does somebody have a copy of that document?

MR. CABOT: There are very few here. There maybe two or three around but --

THE CHAIRMAN: In any case, sir, would you mind repeating your concern about the document that you have in your hands, the terms of reference.

MR. CABOT: This one here, why I mentioned that about advice, you said here on page six:

> "The rights and interests of non-Native people, whatever they may be;",

and why I was saying that, you know, we have to make sure that our rights and interests are being made known, of our concerns, to the Panel, and I am wondering about, and no offence to anyone on the Panel, mind you, but I want to know, make sure that they are going to get in there.

Cabot, sub.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not heard or seen anything that would lead you to believe otherwise, I hope?

MR. CABOT: No, I have not, except going through this document, looking at this document, it says here in (b):

> "The environmental and social protection regime with respect to minimizing the impacts on the Native people by developmental activity affecting the region;",

you know, the (c):

> "The protection of the hunting, fishing and trapping rights of Native people in the Region and their other rights therein with respect to developmental activity affecting the Region;",

and what I am saying is, does this apply to we people as well?

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

MR. CABOT: Because we trap and we hunt and we fish and we pay taxes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are quoting from is a document concerning the Memorandum of Understanding that was entered into by the Minister of Environment concerning the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and --

MR. CABOT: That is into it as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like Doctor Wilkinson to say something about this, because he is so familiar with it. If he could explain briefly why this James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement is being mentioned in connection with this review. Doctor Wilkinson, would you like to do that, please?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: It is a little bit complicated, but I will try and make it clear. As most of you probably know in 1975 a Land Claims Agreement was signed in Quebec between the Cree Indians and the Inuit of Quebec and the two governments.

Now, one chapter of that Land Claims Agreement created what we call an Environmental Protection Regime for northern Quebec, and only for northern Quebec. As the Chairman explained earlier the low level flying and the proposed NATO base are being subject to a review because of a requirement under the laws of Canada, but in addition to that this chapter of the James Bay Agreement would also have required that they be subject to review.

So, it could have happened that the same Projects would have had to be reviewed twice; once under the laws of Canada and once under the James Bay Agreement. There was a series

Cabot, sub.

of negotiations and what was agreed was that these two procedures would be combined into one.

Now, in order to put them together, put simply what was done was that certain parts of the James Bay Agreement, the parts which, in fact, are quoted on page five and page six and page seven of the documents were incorporated into the standard federal procedure.

So, by saying this here in a way that emphasizes the Natives, that is really a special thing that applies to northern Quebec, but elsewhere in the terms of reference I think it is clear that the interests of Indians, Inuit, and white people have all to be taken into account and protected. So, this is not a way to put you down; it is just the result of a Lands Claim settlement.

MR. CABOT: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, I believe that Mr. Stelman Flynn would like to speak to us.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. STELMAN FLYNN:

What Mr. Cabot forget to tell you is that his father was John Cabot, and for those of you who are not Newfoundlanders, that is the fellow who discovered Newfoundland.

I have a geographic description and some history, a very brief history, of the Labrador Straits and I made a copy to pass to the

Flynn, sub.

Panel and if you like it could be read into the record, or, to save time we can skip over it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could ask how long --

MR.FLYNN: It is four pages, typewritten.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you are particularly interested in reading it into the record, then I certainly would not keep you from doing it, but I wonder if you have some other presentation in addition to this, you might consider the time it might take all together to read both documents.

It is not absolutely necessary to read this into the record. It can be entered by having been presented to us.

MR. FLYNN: As long as I know -- I think there is some reason for you guys to have a copy of that, simply because I think some of the points Mr. Cabot has brought out and some that I want brought out to get a better understanding of the area. So, having said that I can probably go on into the presentation that I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please do, thank you very much.

MR. FLYNN: First of all, the Southern Labrador Development Association is a representation of every community between Red Bay and L'Anse au Clair. Mr. Cabot is also a member of this Association and you will find, if you look around

Flynn, sub.

the room a lot of people are Mayors of the communities or representation on Historic Development Corporation, Chamber of Commerce. We all seem to come together when there are briefs and generally the same people.

First of all, in our discussions in the Southern Labrador Development Association, I think it is quite clear that we have no objections to any military training in Goose Bay, provided, of course, that the right precautions are taken for people's safety.

When it comes to the moral issue of whether or not training for any military exercise should occur, I am not the one to judge on that. We are not anti-development and certainly see this as a good opportunity for Labrador to develop and certainly there are some economic benefits that I feel and I would like this committee to look into. I think Mr. Cabot spoke on them and the service base industry to supply Goose Bay was one of them; the tourism potential of this area for people in Goose Bay, how can we utilize that, and so on.

This area has generally had some very good trained people. I am a cook myself and maybe I wonder sometimes what I am doing here, but in the past this area has been progressive, I suppose, compared to the rest of Labrador, or,

Flynn, sub.

in particular the coast of Labrador in its training. For whatever reason, I am not quite clear on, but I think some of it may have been with the International Grenfell Association maybe and the other thing is, I think, we had access to the Newfoundland and certainly Quebec population. So we have an inter-mixing of people.

We do support the idea of development, and certainly feel that the pro support should be heard, and we realize all too often it is the anti feelings that are sometimes brought out. I certainly do not want this to happen like the seal hunt did and a lot of Canadians and a lot of people around the world got one side of the story simply because they had more money than the Newfoundland fishermen and probably more money than the Canadian government wished to put into it.

I am sure if CBC felt this evening that this was going to be a protest, then we would have had all kinds of cameras in here, which demonstrates, I think, we have a concern for development and we certainly would like to see this go ahead.

We are a volunteer organization with a budget approximately $26,500, and we pay a co-ordinator annually, office rental, and whatever other expenses goes with it. So,

Flynn, sub.

it is important that if further meetings are to be held then we certainly want to be a part of them and, certainly, I think you are going to have to look at coming back here again if that process goes on.

We cannot afford to send someone to Montreal or to St. John's or, for that matter, to Goose Bay. When you consider that I have to leave here 10:00 o'clock and maybe get in Goose Bay, if I am lucky, 10:00 o'clock at night, 12 hours travelling.

I think we do not want our community to become a ghost town, but certainly that we want to avail of some of the economic opportunities. We do not have the research facilities or the personnel to do the research for us, so I think it is of the utmost importance that you, with your expertise, look into a few of the points that I am about to bring out.

On the social and economic side, I guess one of the first things that we are going to have to find out is if the NATO base is going ahead, or, if it is just going to be flying. In any case, what economic or what jobs can this create for the people in this area, and I have already said that we do have some of the best trained professionals on the Labrador coast and I feel quite confident in saying that.

Flynn, sub.

If we take 50-60 families from Forteau, with a population of 550, what does that do to the community environment? What does that do to the community togetherness? What does it do to the economics of the community? I mean can my business survive? Already it says that a restaurant survives on a ratio of 1,000 people per establishment, so we are already breaking the code of ethics and surviving and now if you draw more out what does it do?

I guess the other thing is that we have to define the kind of jobs that are going to be available in Goose Bay and how can the people in this area avail of these jobs.

Certainly, if we have a great number of people leaving this area, how will it affect the social and economics of this area? I think that is important to address: How can we minimize the negative effects of too many people leaving Labrador Straits. I know of three families already from Forteau and this is just a small construction job yet, doing some minor repairs to some of the buildings up there, and I know of three families just from this community that are in Goose Bay working right now on construction work.

On the idea of transportation and communications, in the event of this Project going

Flynn, sub.

ahead, will there be a need for the construction of the Trans-Labrador Highway?

Now, we tend to get screwed up a little bit when we talk of the Trans-Labrador Highway. Some talk about going into Quebec; some talk about coming to the Labrador Straits: naturally, for the most economic benefit I would like to see it come to the Labrador Straits. Now, what someone else's perception of the Trans-Labrador Highway is, I do not know, but that is my view. We do two jobs: One is to open up Labrador for greater tourist potential, and certainly, I think, that is an area that can be utilized if you are talking 7,000-8,000 people in Goose Bay.

Will there be a need for the Trans-Labrador Highway, and if so, where will it be coming to? To the south, or to Wabush? Will there be a need for television and radio communications, and I think the committee, at least, your Ottawa worker here, Michel, is certainly aware of this in the past week, is that we knew very little up until the combined councils meeting in Labrador of what actually was happening in Goose Bay and even about this Panel. You see, we do not get television or radio from Goose Bay; it comes out of St. John's and generally what we get is any negative things that are happening, but any positive thing that is happening in

Flynn, sub.

Labrador very seldom gets covered on a provincial radio and television. It is very difficult, because we did not know what you were about, and if you have a Project of this magnitude happening in Labrador and you have this number of flyovers; now, whether it is going to be expanded to cover other areas or not that remains to be seen, but, certainly, we are going to need our people informed. A lot of people travel from here to Black Tickle and so long up the coast to do fishing, and if we are going to have the training that this gentleman mentioned earlier, then it is going to be important that the people be made aware of what is happening.

Certainly, if we are talking of any great number of people in Goose Bay and a lot of families leaving this area, our need for air commercial travel might also need to be looked at, so that I do not have to charter a plane to get to Goose Bay in three hours as opposed to 24 hours.

We did have one other issue that we looked at a few nights ago and that was under training and we were supposed to have some people here this evening to cover that topic, and I am not too familiiar with it, but, in particular, what I would like to see here is that if this committee can identify some of the jobs

Flynn, sub.

that are going to be created in Goose Bay, so that we can avail of these jobs; so that our dependency on a fishery that has failed for the past number of years can be less; and certainly our dependency on unemployment insurance and so on can be less.

So, certainly, we want to be ready for what is happening and we have to know, obviously, what kind of jobs are going to be made available by this Project in Goose Bay if it goes ahead, and certainly with the increase in the military flyovers in Goose Bay we have already seen x number of people leaving this area.

These were some of our concerns. I do not apologize for not having them written them to you. The time just did not allow us to do that, and I would like to take this opportunity to say, thank you, for listening to these views, and contrary to maybe what you have heard be that by our own provincial government or our own federal government, or whomever, this area does have a lot to offer. We have a number of people who are skilled and I would rather see my family -- I have two small kids -- 10 years from now going to Goose Bay to work than over to Alberta to work, and I would like to thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would thank you, Mr. Flynn, for preparing this presentation at such short notice. As I said, you are still

Flynn, sub.

welcome, if you wish, to put this and more on paper and send it to us, preferably by the end of October so that we can put it together with all of the other information coming out of these meetings for the Panel to consider in November.

I wonder if any member of the Panel would care to ask Mr. Flynn any question about any of the points that he has raised. Yes, Doctor Wilkinson?

DOCTOR WILKINSON: You have talked about families who are obliged to leave the community here to find work, now, is the normal pattern that they return after they have finished work on a particular contract or whatever, or once they are gone do they tend to be lost to the community for years?

MR. FLYNN: Obviously, it depends on the nature of the employment but I can speak more closely to home. My brother went to Goose Bay last winter; his family stayed here. He worked in Goose Bay for, I do not know, six-seven months, on renovations on one of the buildings on the base there. He came back. Again, this week he has had another call to go back again.

So, like for example, there are 50 permanent families in Goose Bay right now from this area, so it is difficult to say. It really depends upon the nature of the job and the length

Flynn, sub.

of time the job lasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Flynn, I think in order to maintain a contact, now that we have established one, we certainly need to get parties in this area on the mailing list that the office has for this Project, and probably the more efficient way of doing this, by and large, would be to have listed the councils and the development association and any other bodies in the area who generally involve people in various kinds of activities. That is not to say that we are not prepared to put individuals on the mailing list; we are quite willing to do that, but the most effective way might be to use the organization approach.

Before we all leave here tonight, whoever wants to get him or herself or his organization on the mailing list, please speak to one of the members of the Secretariat.

MR. FLYNN: Basically you have five development associations in Labrador, which, I am sure, would be available through the Rural Development office in Goose Bay, and, in particular, on this geographic description and history you have six elected communities councils governing, I guess the whole population from Red Bay to L'Anse au Clair, and certainly, I mean, if this information comes in and it is sent out and no one

Flynn, sub.

makes use of it, then the onus is on us then, that something should be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are hearing and I am sure we are going to continue to hear expressions of opinion both in favour of the Project and not in favour of the Project. What we are going to try to do is to keep all of this in balance and at the end try to come up with a report that reflects as well as possible the views of as many people as possible in order to come up with a recommendation that will be reasonable and will involve maximum benefits to the greatest number of people.

MR. FLYNN: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else in the audience who, in listening to these two speakers, has felt that he or she might like to get up and speak to us? We are certainly prepared to stay here a little longer, and we have come quite a distance. We are pleased that we did come here, so now that we are here, if you would like to say something please come forward and say it.

MR. CABOT: Mr. Chairman, to further elaborate on the question you asked Stelman on what happened to the families, what are the trends, it is sort of a mixed tank, but we find that eventually what happens that the family will leave and go there if there is a possibility of a more stable income, more earnings there. I know our community alone must have lost about, over the last 10-12 years, maybe 15-20 families, that have gone out, they come back, and eventually went out and stayed because they found the fishery was not stable, the jobs was a bit more stable, and they settle down there and once they begin having their children there and they got out, that was their home. We found it very much when the iron ore mines opened up in the west 30 years ago. There was a lot of families left. Some communities hurt pretty bad in the sense that a lot of their families went out and settled down there and have been there for a long time. Some, when the work got scarce, left it and came back, but most families stayed there.

DOCTOR WILKINSON: Yes, I have done a lot of work in Schefferville, so, obviously, I do appreciate that there were many families from Newfoundland moved there about 30 years ago. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could we give one last opportunity then to anyone else who would like to come forward. As I have said to other people in other places, please do not be bashful or hesitant about coming forward. We want to hear from anyone at all no matter what his occupation or interest.

If not then, I guess the time has come to close the meeting. As I said, we are glad that we came here. I apologize again for the short notice and now that we know that this interest in the Project exists here, we will establish an ongoing contact and as long as the interest remains we will certainly give full consideration to this area whenever we plan any other round of public meetings, and there is certain to be at least one more round, because there are going to be public hearings toward the end of the process.

In the meantime, thank you all for coming, and again, thank you to the speakers for preparing your presentations at short notice. Thank you to the members of the Secretariat who have helped us, as always, in arranging and planning the meeting, be sure to keep in touch. Now, that you are going to get on the mailing list keep in touch with us and we will all work together to bring the best that we can out of this review. Thank you very much, and goodnight.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10:20 P.M.

Volume

8

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	SHESHATSHIT	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 13, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	8	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of
Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet
des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et
au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Peenamin-McKenzie High School, Sheshatshit

DATE: October/octobre 13, 1986.

VOLUME: 8

INDEX

PAGE
Presentation by The Chairman 696
Presentation by Major David McCabe 708

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Father Jim Roche 718
Ben Michel 718
Chief Daniel Ashini 724
Greg Penashue 737
Chief Daniel Ashini 746
Father Jim Roche 751
Simon Michel 771
Lyla Andrew 772
Ponas Noke 778
Robert Lanarie 780
Andrew von Reddy 782
Mary Ann Michel 793
Colonel John David 796

* * * * *

---Upon commencing,

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. My name is David Barnes and I will be the Chairman for the meeting today.

Before we begin the meeting I would like to make sure that everyone knows that we have these translation receivers available. If anyone would like to have one, just go to the back of the room and pick it up.

To open the meeting I would like to call upon Father Jim Roche and Mary Ann Michel to say a prayer.

MARY ANN MICHEL: (Prayer in Innu).

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, there are a few rules which we have been asked to observe while we are here for this meeting. First of all there is to be no smoking here inside the gymnasium. If anyone wishes to smoke, they may use the front entrance of the school, or they may go outdoors.

As I said before, my name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this environmental assessment panel which you see seated before you, which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review into certain existing and proposed military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec.

I would like to introduce to you the other members of the panel. Beginning at the end of the table at your left, Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of a NORAD region which included responsibility for training, equipping, maintaining and deployment of U.S. and Canadian air defence forces.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador. He is Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited in St. John's which is a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resource questions.

Prior to that he was a research biologist with the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

To my left is Mr. Tim McNeill who lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill is knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador, and he was, several years ago, involved in the provincial environmental review of a proposed uranium mine in Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. William Jourdain who lives in Sept-Iles. Mr. Jourdain has been very active in Montagnais band affairs and has been administrative director of Les galeries montagnaise, a shopping centre in Sept-Iles. He also worked for the Iron Ore Company for 20 years before his retirement.

Finally, at the other end of the table, to your right, is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is also a biologist and has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant, established in Montreal, and he has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapi.

I regret to mention at this time that the seventh member of our panel, Mrs. Beatrice Watts, has found it necessary to resign from her position on the Panel. Although we had just begun our work, Mrs. Watts had already demonstrated that she had great potential to contribute significantly to the work of this Panel, so it is with some regret that we accept her resignation.

We are, at the present time, looking for suitable candidates for a replacement.

I am employed in the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa where I am Director for the Atlantic Region.

Prior to that, I was employed with the Newfoundland Department of Environment for about 11 years, in St. John's.

I would also like to introduce to you several people who are very important in our work and the Panel really could not get by without them. I refer, first of all, to the three members of our Secretariat, and I would ask each of them to stand as I identify them.

First of all the Executive Secretary

to the Panel, Mr. Carol Martin. He is assisted by Mr Michel Bourgon and Mr. Jim Clarke.

The proceedings of all of these meetings are recorded and as soon as we can we produce written official transcripts of all the meetings. We have with us today Mrs. Eleanor Thomson. I mention that, and I have introduced her, because all of these transcripts are available to anyone who wishes to have a copy simply by contacting the Federal Environmental Assessment Office in Ottawa.

If anyone wishes to have any informatio concerning the review, the process under which we operate, please speak to one of the members of the Secretariat. For example, you could have your name placed on the mailing list for all information pertaining to this review if you wish.

This Panel is here today because, as I have said earlier, we have been appointed by the Minister of the Environment to conduct this review. In the course of the review we are obliged to go out and meet with all interested members of the public who may feel that they have something to say to the Panel.

I will briefly outline the process we are involved in here. A public environmental review is initiated by the Minister of the Environment whenever a department or agency of the federal government has a proposal for resource development in some area for which it is responsible, and when that department writes to the minister and asks him to appoint a panel for this purpose.

The Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment in February of this year describing the project that is under review here and asking for the review.

This Panel was appointed by the Minister in July, and was given certain terms of reference, or mandate, which the Panel is obliged to follow in the course of the review.

One of the first functions that the Panel must carry out is to define the issues that must be examined in this review to make sure that the right questions are asked, and that the proponent, the Department of National Defence, covers all of the rights and necessary subject matter when it writes its Environmental Impact Statement, the report that will be one of the most important documents in this review.

For this purpose then the Panel, after some preliminary private meetings, published a document which we call Draft Guidelines. The document was published in August of this year and was made available to anyone who wished to have it.

One of the reasons for this series of meetings which we are now carrying out in 17 different locations in Quebec and Labrador, is to hear comments from all interested parties on the content of that draft document. I will be having a little more to say about the content of that draft document in a few moments.

In addition to receiving comments on the Guidelines we are, within the time limits we have available to us in each location, inviting presentations of other information from interested parties which they feel would be important for the Panel to know. We are finding that even if people are not prepared to give us specific analytical comments on the Guidelines that much of the information we do hear is going to be very important to the Panel in that we can extract from it the information we need when we sit down in private to finalize the form of the Guidelines. That is what we intend to do next month after these meetings are over at the end of October. We will modify, adjust and change the Draft Guidelines into a final document which we will issue to the Department of National Defence, probably in December of this year. National Defence will then proceed to write the Environmental Impact Statement, and we expect they will be ready to present it to the Panel some time in the late spring or early summer of 1987. As soon as that report is received by the Panel, it will be made available to the public and will be examined by the public, the Panel, the government and other interested parties during the summer and early fall of 1987.

There will be public hearings to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement, most likely in the fall of 1987. After the hearings are over, the Panel will prepare a report to the Government of Canada which will discuss the project, the expected impact on the environment and will be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence, most likely late in 1987 or early 1988.

Now I will briefly discuss the Draft Guidelines document which I mentioned earlier, for the benefit of those who have not had an opportunity to read this document and who would like to understand a bit of what is included in it.

After a few introductory pages, the Guidelines lay out the scope for the review; that is, in general, the subject matter that is to be covered. The first point to be made is that the Guidelines apply to the entire project, including all activities associated with its construction, with its operations, maintenance, possible termination and demobilization.

In keeping the manner in which the project has been described to us by the Department of National Defence, the Panel has divided the project into two components. The first one to be considered is the present low level flying training operation that has been going on since 1980 by special agreement between the Government of Canada and certain of its NATO -- NATO being the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- allies. The other part of the project is the proposed establishment and operation of a technical fighter weapons training centre for training NATO air forces at Goose Bay. That would include the establishment and operation of weapons and training ranges and all of the associated activities. We will hear a little more about this proposal in a few minutes.

The next part of the Guidelines discusses the methods, the ways in which we would like to see the Department of National Defence carry out the study and gather all of the information needed for its Environmental Impact Statement.

The next section, and this is very important, lists the issues that the Panel has identified. These are the important questions as far as the Panel saw them at the time that we prepared this draft document.

I am going to read each of these issues for you so you can appreciate the questions that the Panel is putting before the Department of National Defence.

The first issue we have identified is the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife.

Issue number two is the effect of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use.

Number three, the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, and in other communities in the project area.

Number four, the impacts of the project

on commercial activities based on renewable resources.

Number five, the impacts on the natural environment on construction activities associated with possible expansion of Goose Bay airport, and the impact of exhaust emissions from aircraft due to increased flying activities.

Number six issue is the cumulative, or additive effects of the project and of other projects and activities in the region.

Number seven is the need for monitoring of the project, if it should be approved. This would be monitoring during construction activities, monitoring during operations, monitoring during close-down.

Issue number eight is the impact of land and sea weapons and training ranges.

The final issue which the Panel has identified to date is the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. The Panel has identified this as a very important issue which must be addressed while, at the same time, we recognize that the Panel does not have a mandate to deal with the subject of land claims policy. That is an important distinction to make.

The final part of the Draft Guidelines document gives instructions to the Department of National Defence on the contents of the Impact Statement, the order of presentation of the information in that report.

I would mention that as a part of the

main document of the Impact Statement and also to be published separately is a summary. That summary document will be published in each of the languages used by the people who stand to feel the effects of this project.

Following the summary the Impact Statement must present the justification for the project; what is the need in terms of international, national and regional treaties and plans, et cetera. The proponent will be expected to state whether the primary justification for the project is socio-economic or some other need, and should present information in support of its argument.

The proponent will also have to discuss other projects which are going on in this area at the present time, and which have been planned and may go on in the near future. This is important so that the Panel can gain an understanding of how this project relates to these other projects, and how the effect of this project under review by the Panel might combine with effects from other projects to cause impacts on the environment.

The next section would be a full, detailed description of the project. I will not go into that at the moment because we will hear, in fact, a brief description of the project in a few moments.

There must also be in the Environmental Impact Statement a description of the existing environment. This is to be presented as a background in order that the Panel can appreciate what effects the project will have when it is introduced into this environment. The sorts of information we would ask for here fall under several headings. For example: geology; climate and air quality; water quality; fish; marine mammals; birds; terrestrial mammals, and plants. In additional to that natural environment, we will also require a description of the social and economic environment of the area and a discussion of the way in which the resources are being used at the present time. For example, we will require information on the distribution and the characteristics of the human population in the area; the economic, the cultural and the social conditions; an evaluation of the social and economic impacts of the low level flight training that has been conducted since 1980; a discussion of resource use in the past, at the present time and predicted in the future; a description of travel and communications in the area, including air travel by subsistence hunters, sport hunters, anglers, tourists and other people. Commercial aviation must be described as it exists here, including the use of air space by international and domestic flights.

We are asking for a summary of the aircraft movements at the Goose Bay area in each of the last six years. We are also asking for a discussion of special areas including ecological reserves, sanctuaries, areas of archeological or historic importance.

We will require a discussion of the urban development plan for Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

And last, but not least, a discussion of the present status of land claims negotiations going on between the Government of Canada and all native groups will be required.

With that as the background, the Department of National Defence will then predict the environmental and the social and economic impacts of the project.

Following the prediction of those impacts, the Department will then put forward certain measures, certain remedial or mitigative measures which it feels might enhance any beneficial impacts coming from the project, and might offset any harmful impacts of the project.

Having done that, the proponent will describe any residual or left-over impacts after those remedial measure have been taken.

That, then, is a brief outline of the Guidelines document. Anyone who does not have a copy and would like to have copy may certainly obtain one by going and speaking to one of the members of the Secretariat.

Are there any questions at this point about the outline of the review itself that I have given, or about the Guidelines document I have just discussed? If anyone would like to ask a question, please use one of the microphones in the middle of the room. Very well, if there are no questions, I will go on.

It is customary, whenever a panel is holding meetings of this sort in public, to invite a representative of the proponent to come along and to give a brief description of the project and to be prepared to answer questions about what the project consists of.

We have with us today Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence. Major McCabe, would you please go to the table at the side, and briefly describe the project for us.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon.

By way of introduction, I would like to give a brief description of my background and involvement with this project.

I spent the first two years of my career in the military in Goose Bay as an air traffic controller. I flew as a fighter pilot just prior to my move to Ottawa where, for the past two years, I have been project officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. I currently work in the Directorate of Air Plans, and I am responsible for all future military developments at Goose Bay.

As you know, Goose Bay airport has had a constant military presence since it was built in 1941, albeit at varying levels of activity.

During its peak years, nearly 12,000 military personnel and dependents lived at Goose Bay.

Since 1980, there has been a noticeable increase in military flying, specifically low level flying.

With the initial interest shown, at that time, by the German Air Force in commencing flying operations here, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low flying activity which also included consideration for the requirement for practice target ranges. The evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activities, and was intended to be in-depth on-site study by specialists. The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible. But as existing data on caribou were inconclusive, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established.

In order to co-ordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Co-ordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordinary Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises air crews on a daily basis of local restrictions such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps, when these are known.

The northern training area has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas, as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on the flying map for the air crew with a five-mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low flying aircraft.

Currently there are four military users at Goose Bay, all of which are signators to a 10-year multinational memorandum of understanding which was signed in February of this year. This agreement covers all military flying activity at Goose Bay.

The United States Air Force has a small detachment of personnel whose primary role is to service transient transport aircraft on their way to and from Europe.

The Canadian Forces operate the long range radar and air traffic control radar facilities, provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft, and, as of March of this year, operate three rescue helicopters on a permanent basis at the airfield.

The Royal Air Force conducts low level flying training using primarily Tornado aircraft.

The German Air Force conducts similar training using F-4 Phantoms, Alpha Jets and Tornados. As well as practicing low level navigation and tactical manoeuvering, these aircraft occasionally use the practice target range located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This range is in an open, sandy area, previously burned out by a forest fire. It is eight miles or about 13 kilometres in diameter, and is clearly marked with signs printed in four languages.

Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range, and some of these have a small smoke charge in them to indicate impact point. There are no plans to use this range for live weapons at this time.

Another site is being examined in the northern training area to establish a second practice range, but no formal approval has been given at this time.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, the current users have indicated a desire to expand their operations somewhat over the next few years. As well, Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing a long-term training program at Goose Bay. The Royal Netherlands Air Force hopes to conduct a half-season training program in 1987 using 10 to 12 F-16 fighters, and about 120 personnel.

The expanded program will continue to be oriented toward low level flying, with some night and poor weather flying being done as required. These last two activities are for training air crews in the use of the terrain-following radar equipment currently installed in Tornado aircraft.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give a brief background for the NATO training centre.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO air forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe, with a concentration over West Germany. Each year, for example, about 538,000 military sorties are flown over Germany day a night, a country with 63 million people in it, and about 110,000 are low level.

Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities.

Recognizing the need to overcome national training shortfalls, and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated tactical fighter weapons training centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO air crews.

Nations were asked to submit their training requirements, and based on these statistics a NATO appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum facility, an ideal facility, to cater to all the training requirements.

As the working group was instructed that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in a

Phase I report, as it is called, submitted to NATO in June, 1983.

Two countries have offered potential sites for the centre, Goose Bay in Canada and Konya Air Base in Turkey. Site surveys were conducted of each site during last year, and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group this past September. NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year.

Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements, and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design of the centre.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December, 1988. During this phase, if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered, then the alternate site would be considered.

The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year. In other words, 45 sorties every two weeks by transport aircraft to support the change-over of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1,300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multinational base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three-year postings, many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by 1,000 to 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangers, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer products stores would be required in the area.

Included in the initial constructions would be up-grading of existing airfield facilities such as a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system.

A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season, or expansion of Trans-Labrador Highway system.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out at the centre, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years.

Suffice it say that as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several training activities depending on their dedicated role. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance; air combat training at medium to high altitudes including supersonic flight; electronic warfare training using on-board and ground-based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery on a optimum of four ranges; live weapons delivery on a optimum of three ranges, for a total of seven; tactical air support of maritime operations, or anti-shipping -- a simple name for it -- using a sea range; and last, flag-type exercises involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles, all flying at the same time.

Several of these requirements are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities from being carried out. This includes a sea range, as I mentioned earlier, which is merely an area for aircraft to fire at targets being towed by ships, or for aircraft to conduct tactical manoeuvres against naval shipping. Several such ranges already exist off the costs of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean if it was established at all.

Since the initial statement of requirements for live weapons ranges that I mentioned earlier, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. This no-drop bomb scoring system, as it is called, has many obvious advantages such as protection of the environment and significant cost-savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions.

Such a system would likely be part of the NATO training centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges, incidentally, are very closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the project.

The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded operation, and also the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full scope optimum facility was examined, as was defined in the Phase I report.

The resulting data therefore are highly speculative, as any down-sizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: the initial construction phase, and the regular operational phase.

During its site survey last year, the

NATO working group examined the towns of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville as possible alternate airfield locations. Alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergencies or weather diversion. They could also be used to launch a small number of aircraft to act as adversary aircraft. Such utilization would require some upgrading such as runway extensions, refueling systems, and possibly some accommodations.

The working group is focusing its attention on locating the NATO training centre over the existing northern training area. The southern training area would still be used for low level flying training, similar to that conducted today.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals which have been discussed and studied to date, are based on the assumption that a full scale training centre would be constructed However, all nations today are undergoing economic cut-backs and belt-tightening exercises, and military programs are not exempt. As actual planning and design details are worked out, and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies adhead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and I am willing to take any questions pertaining to my presentation and the two proposals that are currently under review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Are there any questions for Major McCabe? If anyone would like to ask a question, would you please go to one of the microphones and please state your name for the record before you begin to speak.

FATHER JIM ROCHE: My name is Jim Roche. I have one question, Major.

About one year ago, when there was discussion of the possible NATO Centre going to either Turkey or Goose Bay, there was one suggestion that there was the possibility of a division of some of the exercises or programs between two of the countries. Is that still a possibility, or does it come down to a choice between one or two of the countries?

MAJOR McCABE: In the recommendation report that was submitted in September, that I mentioned earlier, the working group looked at that option of a split training centre, and decided it was economically unfeasible. It has been discarded as an option. That does not mean that it will not end up being like that. The recommendation of the working group is that it be one location or the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

MR. BEN MICHEL: I have a question for the Major, and the panel members as well, I guess.

I would like to address one of the scopes you talked about earlier in your presentation.

It is on page 14, number 9, and it has to do with the effects of the project on the outcome of the negotiations concerning native land claims.

The Panel has identified this as a very important issue while recognizing that it has no mandate to deal with the subject of land claims policy.

The question I would like to raise to the Major, and to the Panel, is a very important one. Canada has very much denied us our existence as a people, and I wonder why it is using the military as a tool to completely deny us the right to survive, the right to existence, the right to live politically, socially, culturally, economically, the way we want to live. This is not Canada. It never has been Canada. When did we cease to exist as people, a separate people from the rest of Canada? That is the issue that the Panel has to address, and the military has to take into account. It denies us that privilege because Canada is a racist country, and it is colonizing our people, and it will continue to do that, and it will continue to harrass the lives that we exercise as a people. It denies us that.

Far more important. Canada has colonized us and is denying us the fundamental right to self-determination, and it has used its military force and its NATO allies to completely destroy a people that are throughout the world recognized as non-existent.

I would like the Major to answer that because it is the proponent's responsibility to address that very issue. Will Canada continue to condemn our peoplehood, our nationhood, as it has already in the past and continues to do this very day, and will continue to do in the future. Is this going to continue to use its military force to make sure that we do not lift the heel that surpresses us as a people? That is the question I would like to raise with the proponent.

MAJOR McCABE: The only response I can give you, Mr. Michel, is first of all the military does not have any dealings of land claims at all. That is other government departments. Therefore, I am not in a position to discuss what Canada will or will not do. I am afraid I cannot respond to that. Possibly the Chairman might want to discuss that. That is not part of the Department of National Defence mandate. I am sure concerns of the Native people are obviously going to be discussed and examined in the course of the environmental study. But I cannot respond to your question about future policies of the Canadian government.

MR. MICHEL: I am sorry, Major, but it says, at 9, "the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims", so it has to be addressed by the proponent at some point. Whether it is done here or through the Panel is totally irrelevant. The question still remains: will Canada still use its military force to oppress and colonize and continue to colonize a people such as the Innu. We are not Native people. We are the Innu people.

MAJOR McCABE: Once again, as you referred to the Guidelines document itself, which will be presented to the proponent, the appropriate people will have to respond to whatever Guidelines are put forth. I am certainly not in a position to give you the kind of response you are looking for right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I could say something in response to your question, Mr. Michel. It seems that the question you are asking has to do with the way in which the Government of Canada is dealing with the Innu people. That, I think, would be regarded as part of the Government's policy, which is a subject we have not been instructed to deal with. The policy is whatever the policy is, and the Panel does not have a mandate to deliberate on that or to reach conclusions on the subject of that policy. We have to use the policy as it exists as a background, and against that background try to determine whether or not the project that is under review will somehow affect the final outcome of the dealings between the Government of Canada and the Innu. I think that is all I could say on that.

MR. MICHEL: Let me address the issue that I am ... I would like to elaborate a little more, and raise another question with regard to that very same item that I have just raised.

We, the Innu people, can only conclude, since the Panel does not have the mandate to deal with the issue of colonization as we perceive it, but a military issue that might or might not impact in the eyes of the Panel members or in the eyes of the proponent, or in the eyes of the general public, then we can only conclude that Canada will continue to militarize, terrorize and colonize and oppress and subjugate a people such as ourselves.

I am using harsh language because this is a harsh problem that we are faced with, and we have to deal with it head-on. I feel that if I were to be silent about the wishes of a people such as my people, then I would not be a very good leader.

Therefore, I say, in conclusion, yes, Canada plans to and will continue to subjugate, oppress and colonize our people through its preconceived conditions such as this one, and any other major industrial developments that will take away the livelihood that our people have used as a means of survival for millenia years.

When did we cease to exist as a people? When did Canada get the right to address issues that are not theirs, such as the one we are faced with today? When did we, the Innu people, give Canada that right? We have never consented for our territory to be used in such a manner that it is planned to be used and is used by through the bi-lateral agreements.

As I said, we can only conclude that

Canada will continue, to colonize and oppress a people such as ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Michel.

Would anyone else like to say something, or ask a question to Major McCabe?

If not then I think this would be a good time to call for a break in the meeting of about 15 minutes.

We have several speakers from this community scheduled to speak to us today, and the common practice for the Panel in small communities is to devote the major part of the time in that community to speakers from that community. However, if there is anyone else who would feel that you would like to say something in the meeting, then I would ask you to give your name to a member of the Secretariate during the coffee break, and if time permits we will hear from you during this meeting.

We will reconvene in about 15 minutes. Thank you.

---Short recess.

---Upon resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now resume the meeting.

As I said earlier, we have notice of several scheduled speakers from this community, so I would now pass the meeting over to Mr. Peter Penashue who will introduce the speakers.

MR. PETER PENASHUE: (Introduced Chief Daniel Ashini of the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council and Gregory Penashue, President of the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association in Innu.)

The next speaker will be Daniel Ashini, Chief of Sheshatshit, and Greg Penashue, President of the NMIA.

---SUBMISSION BY CHIEF DANIEL ASHINI: Mr. Chairman, Panel members, my name is Daniel Ashini, and I am the Chief of the Innu people who are based in the community of Sheshatshit.

I thank you for this opportunity to present to you today the very serious concerns of my people about the expanding military training in our territory. After you hear what I have to say, you will know better why we, the Innu people of Ntesinan are so opposed to these expanding air combat training activities. You will also know what we think should be included in the assessment of the impacts of these activities in our homeland.

I want to start, however, by telling you that I have little faith in the whole environmental review process that you are a part of. We have been actively opposing the military expansion since 1980, and up until very recently our concerns have been laughed at and dismissed out of hand by both the federal government and the government of Newfoundland. Despite our lengthy opposition to the military presence in Ntesinan, the federal and provincial governments have

Ashini, Sub:

only just recently decided to go ahead with the impact assessments. Why were these assessments not done before the government and its NATO allies started to increase their training activities out of Goose Bay in 1979? This is a very good question, and someone in the government should answer it.

But I can give you an answer right now. The answer is that this entire process is occurring not so much out of any real concern for the health and culture of the Innu people, but because of our success at obtaining so much support in Europe and North America from various peace groups, environmental, human rights and cultural survival organizations. There are now over 90 different groups on both continents that support us in our efforts to halt the militarization of Ntesinan.

So, pressure is growing on Canada and and its NATO allies to stop this proposed NATO base and the low-level flights, and the Canadian government hopes to deflect criticism and opposition by getting you people to do an environmental review over the next couple of years. In our view, the FEARO review is intended by the Canadian government as a big public relations exercise to convince other NATO members and the Canadian public that it is being completely responsible in dealing with our very real concerns. We believe that if the Canadian government was in fact responsible, and sincerely respected our concerns for our health and culture, it would call for a moratorium on low level flying and plans to build the NATO base until after comprehensive impact studies are complete.

Instead, the Canadian government promotes increased militarization of Ntesinan and starts studies of the impact of this militarization only after it has committed itself to the increase. Conducting impact assessments after the development has already started or has been agreed to by government makes a big joke out of the whole environmental impact assessment process.

We believe that ultimately the government is more interested in its public relations image and shutting up all those noisy Innu people, than really addressing the genuine health, cultural and environmental concerns of the Innu.

We believe that even if you people determine, as have we, that the land where military air combat training occurs will be made uninhabitable and will threaten the very survival of our culture, the federal government will ignore your recommendations and proceed with the military development anyways.

I want to state to you as well, that when you are addressing the concerns of the Innu people, you are addressing not just the concerns of the Sheshatshit Innu, but those of the entire Innu nation of 9,600 people in the Quebec-Labrador peninsula.

Despite what you may hear from government and the Canadian Armed Forces, opposition to the

Ashini, Sub:

military expansion in Ntesinan is not just from the Innu of Sheshatshit, but from all the Innu. The extent of this opposition is to be seen in the resolution passed by Innu chiefs and band council representatives at the May 1985 Assembly held at North West Point. Representatives from Davis Inlet, Sheshatshit, St. Augustin, La Romaine, Natashquan and Mingan signed that resolution. The Conseil Attikamek Montagnais has stated its firm opposition as well, and had just published a well researched preliminary report backing up our argument that air combat training activities pose a serious public health problem to our people.

The Assembly of First Nations is giving us its full support, and at the last general assembly of the AFN in St. John's, Indian chiefs from across Canada voted in support of a resolution by Chrysologue Ambroise, Chief of the Sept-Iles/Maliotenam Band Council instructing the AFN executive to pursue legal action to stop the militarization of Ntesinan as well as the lands belonging to other First Nations.

I raise this point first to stress the fact that we, the Innu, are all one people, living in one nation called Ntesinan, despite the artificial separation of our territory by the Quebec/Labrador border. More than just the Labrador portion of our nation is being affected by the military build-up based in Goose Bay. Perhaps one half of the land covered by the low level flying zones is in the

Ashini, Sub:

Province of Quebec. I raise this point as well to tell you to beware of seemingly factual statements by representatives of the Canadian Armed Forces who may attempt to mislead you as to the nature of our protest. For example, the pamphlet advertising Goose Bay as a good location for the NATO training base makes no mention of our relatives who live in the Quebec portion of Ntesinan. Also, Lieutenant Colonel John David, the Base Commander here at Goose Bay, continues to promote the myth that"only a fraction of the Innu people are opposed to the military presence in Labrador" (quoted in the Evening Telegram, September 9, 1986, page 3). We see this kind of distorted information from the CAF and DND as a purposeful attempt to mislead the Canadian and European publics about the great extent to which we Innu people are seriously affected by the military expansion on our territory.

Nature of the problem: I want now to outline the nature of the problem that we have with the increasing military air combat training operations in Ntesinan. The problems may be separated into four broad categories: (1) the impact of air combat training activities on Innu people while they are pursuing various hunting activities in the interior of Ntesinan; (2) the impact of these training activities on the wildlife upon which we depend; (3) the socio-economic and the socio-medical impacts of the expanding military presence at Goose Bay on the community of Sheshatshit; and (4) the serious prejudice

Ashini, Sub:

to our rights and land claims posed by the military expansion.

Number one, the impact of air combat training: As you probably well aware, the main problem we are experiencing at the moment is with low level flight training by West German Phantom II and British Tornado aircraft. These aircraft are flying at 100 feet or less over our hunting territories and are frequently encountered by our people while they are living at their hunting camps or while they are away from camp fishing, checking their traps, hunting large and small game or gathering wild fruits. The extremely loud and unexpected noice produced by these jets is very traumatic for both adults and children alike. But we are especially concerned about how our children and our elders react to this unwanted and hazardous noise. Our children are terrified of these jets, and many do not want to go into the country because of them. We are worried that those of our elders who have heart conditions will die prematurely in the country as the result of the sonic boom or the noise from a low level jet.

We are extremely worried that many of our people do not want to go to the country any more to pursue the hunting way of life of our ancestors because they do not want to risk their health or that of their children by being exposed to the very loud jet noise and, in the future, sonic booms.

When we talk about the jets flying so

low that their exhaust makes ripples on the surface of the lakes, makes the canvas on our tents flap, and sways trees, we are not exaggerating. When we say that the planes fly so low that our hunters can see the faces of the pilots and feel the hot exhaust on their own faces, we are not exaggerating. When we say that the wildlife reacts badly to these noisy jets, we are not exaggerating. Settler people from across the river, at North West River, have had exactly the same experiences as ourselves. The late Howard Mercer, who was a well known bush pilot based in Goose Bay, had the same experiences as ourselves, as have countless sports hunters and fishermen in Labrador and Quebec. Howard Mercer described the noise from a low level jet as ear shattering.

Despite assurances from the CAF that every possible effort is being made to avoid us while we are in the country, the NATO jets continue to make regular overflights of our hunting parties and camps. British Tornado and West German Phantom II aircraft made frequent overflights of our men, women and children at Andrew's Lake last spring. Andrew's Lake is near the Red Wine River and Disappointment Lake. I include here a photograph taken by an Innu person last spring of a Tornado jet flying over the campsite at Andrew's Lake. For a number of reasons, it is impossible for military jets to avoid our hunting camps and parties in the interior of Ntesinan, and plans to expand low level flying either as a result of the NATO base or bilateral

Ashini, Sub:

agreements will make this problem much worse in the future.

We know that rural people in the United States and Europe are also suffering from supersonic and low level air combat training. The German Initiatives Against Low Level Flying was formed to fight against the low level flying in that country. Unfortunately for us their efforts have been successful to the extent that the West German government has decided to export its unwanted public health problem to Ntesinan. People in rural Scotland, England and Wales also want a stop to these kinds of air combat training, as do people in Nevada, California, Montana, Utah and North Dakota in the United States. But they are told that the terrible noise and property damage they experience is the price they must pay for freedom, that the noise is the sound of freedam or the price of peace.

It seems strange to us that what is well recognized by governments in the U.S. and Europe as a serious public healtn problem is not recognized as such in Canada. When we say that low level jet noise is a serious health problem, we get arrogant and racist comments from the likes of Mr. John Crosbie, who told a group of NATO ambassadors last spring that low level jet noise is no worse that the noise levels produced by a Sony Walkman tape deck.

Our concerns abou the impact of jet noise on our mental health and hearing have now been backed up by the preliminary study conducted by the

Ashini, Sub:

Conseil Attikamek Montagnais. Using information obtained from the United States Air Force and the Royal Air Force, this study shows that the noise levels produced by low flying jets is well above the pain threshold. For example, a Phantom II jet can produce 140.8 decibels of noise at 100 feet and 300 knots when at full power. The World Health Organization says that this amount of noise can cause immediate and permanent ear damage to people who are exposed to it for even a brief period of time. We know as well that people can never get used to the dangerous noise produced by the planes because its noise arrives so suddenly. People cannot control the startled reaction they have to this sudden and very loud noise, and therefore will always be traumatized when it arrives. This explains why our men, women and children react the way they do when they encounter a military jet in the country. Our children panic and go hysterical with fright when the jets fly over. No one in their right mind would want to subject children, let alone themselves, to this very loud and unexpected noise.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough the point that country life for the Innu people gives great meaning and self-worth. The land is a spiritual place for us, like a cathedral to Europeans, and is normally free of the problems and stresses of the community. I should say that it was relatively stress free and peaceful until the military jets started to disturb us so much.

Ashini, Sub:

If you want to better understand why we are outraged at the military flights over our land, try to imagine the sense of violation that you would experience if, without warning, you were blasted by 140 decibels of noise while you were in the midst of praying in some ancient cathedral that your ancestors had also prayed in during many centuries.

Before I leave this particular topic, I want to draw your attention to the fact that the U.S. Navy is offering $10.2 million to the ranching people of Dixie Valley, Nevada, in compensation for removing them from land that will be made uninhabitable as a result of the large numbers of sonic booms that will be produced by Navy jets. This decision to provide compensation recognizes that air combat training is a serious public health hazard. We believe that sonic booms will be generated in large numbers with the air-to-air training that will occur if the NATO base is built at Goose Bay.

I also want to draw your attention to the U.S. Navy's decision in 1974 not to locate a supersonic training area in Pamlico Sound, North Carolina. This decision was made as a result of public protests from environmentalists, businessmen, recreational hunters and fishermen as well as the Navy's own Environmental Impact Statement that concluded that people could not exposed to the sonic booms and noise from air combat aircraft. The U.S. Navy set up the Oceana Supersonic Training Area off the coast of North

Ashini, Sub:

Carolina, over the sea, because of public protests and the conclusions in its EIS.

Let me ask you this question: If air combat training activities are recognized as a serious public health problem in the U.S., why are they not recognized as such in Canada? If the U.S. Navy decides not to allow this kind of training over people in North Carolina, why should DND allow it to occur over the Innu people in Ntesinan?

Number two, the impact of air combat training activities on the wildlife: I wish to talk now about our concerns about the wildlife upon which we depend for the survival of our culture. We Innu people continue to use the land very much. We continue to hunt, fish, trap and gather wild berries and plant medicines especially when we are in the country at various locations each fall and spring.

The Conseil Attikamek Montagnais has provided detailed harvesting information demonstrating that the Innu from La Romaine gain a major portion of their livelihood from the land. We in Sheshatshit have not yet conducted harvesting studies to document the numbers of animals and fish we harvest each year, but I can assure you that we use the land just as much as the Innu of La Romaine. Our hunters are very active while they are in the country providing for their families and doing what they know best.

While we lack the kind of harvesting statistics that have been provided by the La Romaine

Ashini, Sub:

Innu, we do have other documentation that demonstrates where we have traditionally pursued our harvesting activities. Adrian Tanner of Memorial University has completed a land use and land tenure study among our people that demonstrates that we have been primary users of Ntesinan for many, many years. Jose Mailhot, an anthropoligist based in Montreal, has also documented the continuing extensive use of the land made by the Innu people of Sheshatshit. To demonstrate to you that we continue to use the land extensively and harvest wildlife in large numbers, I invite you all to visit our camps in the country. You can then observe first hand the great extent to which we continue to use the land.

All of this land use is, of course, dependent on hunting and trapping the animals, fishing and gathering berries and medicinal plants. That is why we are so concerned about the impact of the military expansion on the wildlife. Our hunters have already observed the result of low level flights and believe many wildlife species such as mink, marten, caribou and migratory waterfowl are adversely affected. These concerns have been back up by information from fox and mink farmers who report that when their farms get flown over at low level, the female mink and foxes eat their young. We know that United States Air Force pilots in Europe have a saying for noise sensitive places,such as hospitals, that they must not overfly. They call them mink farms, which

Ashini, Sub:

recognizes the fact that female mink eat their young when exposed to sudden and loud noise. We want to know whether the mink, marten, foxes and other furbearers react this way when they are living in the country.

We also know that Canadian Wildlife Service biologists studying black ducks at Snegamook Lake north of Goose Bay noticed that the ducks disappeared after the lake was overflown by West German jets in 1981. The biologists think the ducks may have disappeared because of the loud and unexpected noise from the jets. The jets were flying over the lake about two times each day in 1981, but after these flights were greatly reduced, as a result of requests from the biologists, the black ducks returned to the lake once again.

I would stress here that it is not good enough just to avoid the migratory waterfowl on the coast of Labrador, because many waterfowl species use inland areas and are being overflown by the military jets. Biologists have also noted that osprey also react badly to the loud noise from the jets. All of this indicates that the FEARO review should study carefully the impacts of military training on all wildlife species, not just the caribou. For us, the Innu people of Quebec and Labrador, all the wildlife species are very important, and we do not want to see any of them harmed as a result of the military training on our land.

Thus, the FEARO review, we believe, must study with great care the impacts of low level jet noise and sonic booms on all wildlife species in the Ntesinan. In addition, it must look at the possible environmental problems resulting from the contamination of air and water by chemicals in the exhaust of low level jets. Large amounts of dangerous chemicals could be spewed into the air and on to the water by these jets which could then contaminate our drinking water and the wildlife upon which we depend. The review must also look at the possible contamination of water supplies resulting from chemicals leaking out of unexploded bombs or missiles on the bombing ranges and from the crashes of military aircraft. Military planes have already crashed in Ntesinan, and will continue to crash. Will these crashes, when they occur, contaminate water supplies or start forest fires?

MR. PETER PENASHUE: Mr. Greg Penashue will continue with our presentation.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. GREG PENASHUE:

I think we could go on to the socio-economic and socio-medical impacts of expanding militarization.

There are a number of issues relating to the socio-economic and socio-medical impacts of the expanding military presence that are very important to us in Sheshatshit. These concern primarily, (a) the impact of increasing numbers of military men in Goose Bay, and the expansion of Happy Valley-Goose Bay in

Penashue, Sub.

in general, and (b) what would happen to the Innu if our men, women and children are denied access to the countryside for hunting, trapping and fishing because the land has been made uninhabitable due to low level jet noise and sonic booms.

The first concern here is a very sensitive one for us in Sheshatshit. I have a great deal of difficulty talking about it in public because it is painful for me emotionally even to think about it. What I am talking about here is the sexual abuse of young Innu women from Sheshatshit by the military men who are stationed temporarily at the base. West German military men have been travelling down to Sheshatshit loaded up with alcohol with which to entice our young women down to the base. When the party is over, and the new day arrives, these young women are not even given the courtesy of a ride back Sheshatshit, but must arrange their own transportation.

It is well known that the sexual abuse of women living in the neighbourhood of military bases by military men is a common occurrence. In some locations, for example the United States Air Force base in the Philippines called Clark Air Force Base, the abuse of women has become a profitable industry with large numbers of young women having fallen into prostitution as a way of life.

We do not like the present abuse that is being done to our younr women in Sheshatshit, and

Penashue, Sub.

we are very concerned that more of it will occur in the future especially if the NATO base is built in Goose Bay.

The government is destroying our souls by allowing the military to erode our way of life in the country. But it is destroying the souls of our young women by allowing military men to come down to Sheshatshit just to take them back to the base for an evening of abuse.

In the view of the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council and NMIA, the impact of increasing numbers of military men and women in the Lake Melville region must be an important component of the FEARO review and the Department of National Defence's Environmental Impact Statement. I should point out that it is not just Innu women who stand to suffer from this expanding male presence in the region, but all women including Inuit and the settlers.

The military expansion in Goose Bay will bring another kind of social rot with it. This is the problem of alcohol that has already taken such a terrible toll on my people. There are certainly more bars built in Happy Valley-Goose Bay to service the resident and transient military personnel. The FEARO review must consider in its assessment what the impact of more bars will have on the entire Lake Melville population, including the Innu of Sheshatshit.

The FEARO review must also undertake

Penashue, Sub.

a careful review of the numbers and kinds of jobs that will result from the military expansion. We, ourselves, are interested in employment, but employment in renewable resource industries that do not compromise the environment or the life styles of our people who wish to actively continue to hunt and trap and fish.

As far as we are concerned, this rules out the military expansion as a viable way to create employment. Nevertheless, we know full well that with large projects such as the proposed NATO base, native people are generally last hired and first fired. We do not believe that the expansion of the air combat training in Goose Bay will provide any job benefits for our people. Even if there were a few scraps available to us, this would not compensate us for the damage the military training will do to our culture, our mental and physical health and the wildlife.

(b) We agree completely with the conclusions of the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais preliminary report with regard to the consequences of expanding air combat training that denies our people access to the country. The report states that low level jet noise and sonic booms are incompatible with the hunting, trapping and fishing and gathering activities of the Innu from La Romaine while they are living in the interior of Ntesinan. Given the great importance of harvesting various wildlife species in Innu culture, an increasingly stressful and threatening

Penashue, Sub.

environment as a result of jet noise and sonic booms, associated with a decrease in the quality and abundance of wildlife, will be translated into a negative social impact for the community of La Romaine. The author of the report foresees certain negative economic impacts resulting from military expansion, including a decrease in revenues from the sale of furs, and a decrease in the contribution of quality bush foods in the diet of La Romaine Innu. Of course, this has negative consequences for health as well.

But the increasing jet noise and sonic booms would also result in a decrease in the interest of many Innu in practicing their subsistence hunting way of life in the interior of the territory. Denied access to the country, we would have more and more trouble passing on to our children all the important skills and knowledge that have been our heritage for thousands and thousands of years and that are really only properly acquired while living in the country.

The CAM report identified a number of long-term consequences which are as follows: a transfer of hunting activities into parts of the territory that are less frequently overflown; as a result, concentration of more and more Innu on an increasingly small territory; over exploitation of the wildlife resources in this small territory; over exploitation of the wildlife resources in the vicinity of the community; increasing conflict with non-Innu over the exploitation

Penashue, Sub.

of the wildlife resources in the vicinity of the community; increased sedentarisation; increased competition for employment in the community, limited as the employment is; increase in social problems in the community such as violence, suicide, delinquence and alcohol abuse; increase in health problems associated with a sedentary way of life such as cardiovascular illness, diabetes, hypertension, et cetera.

In the view of the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council and the NMIA, these problems will also occur in the community of Sheshatshit as a result of expanding air combat training activities in Ntesinan.

When seen in the context of other planned developments in the region, such as the building of dams on major rivers on the lower North Shore of Quebec and on the lower Churchill River, the Trans-Labrador Highway, a possible mine at Lac Brisson and the designation of public parks or wilderness conservation areas, the survival of our ancestors' hunting way of life appears seriously in doubt. Horrible social problems such as alcohol abuse and family violence are just some of the consequences of denying us access to the country and the culture collapse that results from this.

Number four, prejudice to Innu rights and land claims: We are happy to read in the Draft Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement to be done by DND that an important issue is the effects of

Penashue, Sub.

the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. Unfortunately, land claims policy is not within the mandate of the FEARO Panel to consider. For us, the fact that land claims policy is not up for discussion is a very serious problem. At this moment, federal land claims policy allows only six groups with comprehensive claims to negotiate at any one time. The Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association which represents the Innu people in Sheshatshit and also Davis Inlet is not one of these six groups. Who knows when we will be able to begin negotiations. But, at the same time, we have a massive military development taking place in Ntesinon that seriously prejudices our rights and land claims, and will make our land claims negotiations extremely difficult when they finally occur.

The military expansion represents a major third party interest in our territory. The more military facilities, for example the bombing ranges, that are put in place, and the more air combat that is conducted, the less land there will be available for us to negotiate over in our land claims negotiations. We are not even permitted to engage in land selection prior to the implementation of this military expansion so that important hunting territory can be protected for future use. Building the bombing ranges and expanding the frequency of air combat activities before a land claims settlement is negotiated, seriously

Penashue, Sub.

reduces the benefits we might obtain from such a land claims agreement.

Land that has been taken over for bombing ranges and for intensive air combat training, with frequent sonic booms, will not be available to us as part of a land settlement. Obviously, this represents a very serious prejudice to our land claims. It is one identified by Thomas Berger in his report on the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry. Referring to the pipeline, Berger says:

> "If the pipeline is built before a settlement of Native claims is reached, then the land is required for the pipline right-of-way, the energy corridor, and their ancillary facilities will have been selected, and will thereby be excluded from any later selection of land for use by the Native people." Vol. 1, p. 192.

Substitute low level flying and NATO base for pipline, and you have exactly the same situation here in Ntesinan.

Allowing the military expansion to proceed prejudices our land claims and rights in another way. It will bring more non-Innu people along with non-Innu values and political institutions into Ntesinon which will make it very difficult for us to achieve self-determination, that is, to regain the kind

Penashue, Sub.

of control over our lives that will ensure the survival of our hunting culture.

This was an important point made by the Dene people in their submission to the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry. The non-Innu people that move into Ntesinan will have very different ideas from our own about what should happen to the land. Their ideas will conflict with our own ideas. The more non-Innu people there are in the territory, the more difficult it will be for us to have a major say in what kinds of developments should occur on our land in future years to come. This obviously limits the extent to which we can exercise self-determination in Ntesinan.

We are not interested in a simple real estate transaction and monetary compensation for the loss of our land in our land claims negotiation, when it finally happens. We are interested in negotiating political rights that will give us meaningful jurisdiction over the lands under our control. But it will be impossible for us to exercise such political rights if significant portions of the territory have been taken from us for military expansion. We will have no land to exercise juridiction over.

Murray Coolican, in his report on federal land claims policy, has an important point to make about how the government allows third party interests to accumulate on native lands prior to negotiations. He says that:

> "The current situation is unfair to aboriginal groups. Although the federal government has agreed to negotiate claims relating to vast areas, it continues to behave as though claims did not exist. Land is alienated, projects are authorized, and management decisions are made with little, if any, regard to the claim. For the government business proceeds much as usual. Because the functions of government are unimpaired by the claim, government feels no pressure to move negotiations forward. Aboriginals, meanwhile, ses their claim area being subjected to more and more third party interest. Their only method of encouraging the federal government to take their claim seriously is through litigation." Coolican, 1986, p. 63.

MR. PETER PENASHUE: I will now turn over to Chief Ashini.

---SUBMISSION BY CHIEF DANIEL ASHINI:

We may soon have to pursue legal action to stop this military expansion because we are not presently on the list of native organizations able to negotiate with the federal government, and because our land claims and rights are being seriously prejudiced.

Ashini, Sub.

The rapidly increasing third party interest in our land is a grave and urgent problem and must be stopped until our negotiations are over. The FEARO review must take into account the fact that our land claims and rights are being affected in this way, and that the present land claims policy of the federal government is a serious obstacle to the resolution of the present conflict with the military through a land claims agreement.

The FEARO Panel must also be in a position to recommend that all military expansion be halted until such time that Innu land claims settlements have been completed, whether they be settlements with the Conseil Attikamek Montagnais, Sept-Iles/Maliotenam Band Council, or Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association. I am talking about a moratorium on all military training activities in Ntesinan. The idea of imposing such a moratorium on military training is suggested in the Coolican Task Force report on land claims policy. The Task Force states that:

> "In areas of federal jurisdiction south of 60 for which a comprehensive claim has been accepted, the federal government should refrain from authorizing activities or land alienations that could derogate from the aboriginal rights asserted, unless such activities or alienations either have been

consented to by the affected aboriginal group or are essential to the national interest." Coolican, 1986, p. 63.

The expanding military presence in Ntesinan is certainly a matter of federal jurisdiction, and the present and planned training activities have not been defined as essential to the national interest. We believe, therefore, that the federal government should adopt the Coolican recommendation quoted above and impose a moratorium on military training activities in our territory until such time that our land claims have been negotiated.

In closing, I would like to bring one last important matter to your attention. This is the issue of what will happen to the FEARO review process if NATO decides to build its training base in Konya, Turkey. The Draft Guidelines state that the continuation of the review of the NATO base will depend on a decision by NATO, expected in late 1986, as to whether or not to build the training base in Goose Bay. Our concern here is that even if the NATO base goes to Konya, we may end up with almost the same kinds of air combat training and support facilities as a result of bilateral agreements. We are concerned that incremental increases in the military presence will occur even without a NATO base, and that the FEARO review would only address a portion of these increases, such as expanded low level flying and the construction of one or two more bombing ranges. What guarantees do we have

Ashini, Sub.

that a development ten years down the road involving, for example, plans to train helicopter pilots in methods of attacking tanks, use new types of live ammunition and missiles on the bombing ranges, build instrumented air combat manoeuvering ranges, or conduct supersonic air combat, would receive a comprehensive environmental evaluation?

It seems to us, therefore, that the FEARO review must study carefully all the possible air combat training scenarios that are likely to arrive in the next 15 to 20 years, or more, as a result of bi-lateral agreements. For us, these bi-lateral agreements are just as threatening as is the proposed NATO joint training base.

The FEARO review must also assess the impacts of military expansion which has nothing to do with bi-lateral agreements, but occurs solely on the initiative of the Department of National Defence. This type of expansion would include the kind of military manoeuvre that was conducted last January in North West River, Sheshatshit, Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Mud Lake. It was called Operation Lightning Strike. It involved about 900 CAF soldiers and tracked vehicles, as well as fighter aircraft and helicopters. Does DND plan on having more of these kinds of exercises in the future? What impact will they have on the wildlife and the Innu people?

Let me end up, then, by stressing once

again how intent we are to continue our hunting way of life in the interior of Ntesinan. We may be interested in integrating aspects of your culture into our own, particularly technological aids to harvesting. Some of us may wish to take up wage employment in the renewable resource sector and the school or band council administration as a primary occupation. But as is the case among the James Bay Cree, many of us will also want to continue to hunt, trap, fish and gather as a primary occupation.

We want to keep the door open to our children and grandchildren for them to be able to pursue the traditions of our ancestors in the interior of Ntesinan. The great many Innu who continue to go into the country each fall and spring will be our lifeline to the past and to the future, a lifeline that will be of the greatest importance to us all in permitting us to pass on to future generations the great wealth of knowledge about the animals and the land that is our heritage.

I thank you for your time and for your attention to the important concerns I have raised before you here today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, gentlemen. I notice that it is after 5:00 o'clock now, and we were intending to end the first session of this first meeting at 5:00 o'clock. If everyone agrees, is it all right then to end this session now and return a little later? Would that be acceptable?

Fine. We will break for dinner and return at 7:00 o'clock tonight.

Thank you very much.

---Dinner adjournment.

---Upon resuming at 7:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We are ready to begin our evening session of this meeting.

To introduce the speakers for this evening, I turn the meeting over to Mr. Peter Penashue.

MR. PETER PENASHUE: The next person on the list is Father Jim Roche who is the priest here in Sheshatshit.

---SUBMISSION BY FATHER JIM ROCHE: Mr. Chairman and Panel members, my name is Jim Roche. I am a Catholic Priest and have been Pastor here in the community of Sheshatshit for just over two years.

I appreciate having the opportunity to speak to you this evening concerning the Draft Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec.

I would also like to use this opportunity to raise some questions and concerns about these activities, concerns which I hope will be addressed by the EIS to be done by the proponent.

By way of introduction I would want to

Roche, Sub.

say that my perceptions and views concerning these military activities have been very much influenced by living and working among the Innu people, both here in the community and for extended periods of time in the country.

However, I do not consider myself to be a spokesman for the Innu, and as you witnessed in La Romaine and here again today, the Innu are able to speak very well for themselves.

I will begin my presentation by first addressing the Draft Guidelines, and then will speak to a number of issues concerning the present and proposed military flying activities.

The February 13, 1986 letter of Associate Minister of National Defence, Harvie André, states that broad policy issues such as native land claims and Canada's defence policy would not properly be within the scope of an environmental assessment.

This decision, in my opinion, marks a fundamental flaw in the whole process of assessment, and is one of several examples which I would hope to highlight which would indicate that the FEARO process, in this case, is highly weighted in favour of the proponent.

The Associate Minister gives no justification for his exclusion of these very important issues, and by their exclusion he very conveniently removes from the assessment process many individuals

Roche, Sub.

and groups who have voiced the strongest opposition to these military activities, and have raised the most serious questions about their development.

While the Draft Guidelines do identify the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning land claims as an inssue to be addressed, I believe this skirts an ethical question concerning industrial development and land claims, and I will return to this later in the presentation.

Number two, in this same letter,which requests that the EARP be initiated, the Associate Minister states that the new North Warning radar system should be considered a separate initiative, and should be considered independently. My fear is that by separating the various projects involved, the full impact and cumulative effect of these combined activities will be missed.

While the Guidelines do call for the EIS to include information on all probable developments within the area, I am afraid it could be argued that, given the terms of reference presented by the proponent, the Panel technically does not have the mandate to address even such developments.

Number three, the decision of the Panel to divide the project into two components is a further example of how the process favours the proponent. Again, the reason for this decision is to be found in the mandate given by the proponent to the Panel.

Roche, Sub.

Without reason or justification, DND has determined that the Panel should seek ways to minimize the adverse effects of low level flight training, and secondly, to recommend whether the TFWTC should proceed or not.

In my opinion, the adverse effects of low level flight training are such that the Panel should recommend whether or not they too should proceed or not. It is not enough simply to look for ways to minimize possible negative impacts.

Number four, it is unfortunate that, given the pressures of time, the Panel is not able to seek the opinions of the Innu who are in the country. As you may be aware there are approximately 200 people from this community in the country at this time. Perhaps in the second phase of public hearings, after the distribution of the EIS, an effort could be made to enable these individuals to participate.

Five, and finally, in terms of the Draft Guidelines, I am left wondering what the purpose of the assessment really is.

Given the facts that, first, bi-lateral agreements for low level flight training have already been signed, and more are actively being pursued; secondly, NATO will have made a decision concerning the TFWTC prior to the completion of the study; three, the federal government is committed to promoting Goose Bay as a TFWTC and has committed large amounts

Roche, Sub.

of money to achieve this; and, fourthly, the FEARO process itself is set up in such a way that the proponent can determine what can and cannot be addressed by the study, and it is the proponent, and not some independent body, that predicts the possible negative impacts.

All of this would lead me to share the opinion of others who have already addressed the Panel, and to wonder with them as to the value of the study.

However, in the hope that the ideas and concerns expressed by people will be listened to and will have some impact, I would like to address a number of other issues related to the proposed developments.

The initial environmental evaluation: I imagine that one of the reasons for DND's decision not to have the Panel recommend whether or not the low level flight training should continue or not, would be that in their IEE report, by Colonel Landry, they determined that the environmental concerns were not of such significance as to warrant a formal review.

However, it should be noted that several groups and organizations have judged this document to be inadequate. And I quote first a letter of the LIA of January, 1983:

> "The IEE which DND prepared is in our view inadequate, in places wrong in fact, and definitely not a document

Roche, Sub.

> that should be treated as the final word on the situation."

And, secondly, a letter of the NMIA to the Minister of National Defence in December of 1984:

> "We are unable to find any independent expert who is willing to accord this Landry IEE the status of a serious scientific review."

It is also significant that these two organizations, and others, more than five years ago formally called for a full environmental assessment.

My own limited reading and research, for example in the area of the effects of aircraft on wildlife, would lead me, as well, to question the value of this IEE report. I shall mention this again later in the presentation.

I believe that it is because of such concerns around this IEE that such groups as Project Ploughshares and Project North have requested that a full public inquiry, rather than an EARP study, be undertaken to examine the full range of military development plans. I believe that a public review would have allowed for a greater effort to receive public views, and would have allowed for a study that was wider in scope.

Innu concerns and opposition: Over these past two years living among the Innu, I have experienced the suffering and the powerlessness of the

(Page 758 follows...)

Roche, Sub.

people as they struggle to preserve their culture, their indentity and their homeland, Ntesinan. In the midst of that struggle, I believe I have also experienced their strengths as a people. This is perhaps most evident in the contrast of my experience of the people when they live here in the village, and when they are on the land.

In May of 1985, Innu representatives from almost all of the Innu communities gathered here to discuss the militarization of their homeland. At that gathering, the elected representatives of these communities unanimously passed a resolution which outlines their unconditional opposition to the use of their territory for military purposes. They did so as the legitimate owners of this territory -- it has never been ceded by any treaty or land claims agreement -- and they listed among their reasons their conviction that low level flight training was seriously affecting wildlife, and was, moreover, seriously disrupting their life in the country. It seems to me that the will of the people and their concerns have not been and continue not to be taken seriously.

There has also been a tendency on the part of DND, in particular, to try and simplify the issues involved by suggesting that if they simply avoid over flying Innu camps in the country, there will be no more problems. This attitude represents a failure to appreciate the complexity and the seriousness

Roche, Sub.

of the issues involved. At the heart of Innu opposition are the issues of self determination, involvement in decision making which will affect their homeland and the survival of a people as a people.

My own perception is that if the military plans go ahead, in terms of increased low level flight training and the development of a tactical fighter weapons training centre on the scale suggested, eventually large sections of Ntesinan would become restricted zones, or uninhabitable lands in which the people would not be able to live or travel.

As the people lose this tie to the land I believe this will have a disastrous effect on the life of the people.

The decision of the federal government to approve and to promote these military training activities on unsurrendered aboriginal lands, in my mind raises ethical questions and would lead me to question the government's commitment to negotiate in good faith in any future land claims settlement.

The Coolican report on land claims policy, issued last spring and mentioned this afternoon, attempts to protect aboriginal rights in face of federally supported projects prior to the settlement of a claim, and states that, and I quote:

"In areas of federal jurisdiction south of 60 for which a comprehensive

Roche, Sub.

> land claim has been accepted, the federal government should refrain from authorizing activities or land alienations that could derogate from the aboriginal rights asserted, unless such activities or alienations have been consented to by the affected aboriginal group or are essential to the national interest."

If this section of the report comes to be accepted as government policy, it seems to me that the government would be obligated to refrain from authorizing low level flight training and the installation of a tactical fighter weapons training centre until there was a land claims settlement.

Economic issues: In an effort to promote military training activities, much has been made of the millions of dollars which would be invested in this area. This attitude fails to recognize, however, that material well being is only one component of a decent human life. Equally important, it seems to me, is the ability of individuals to participate in the decisions that will affect one's life. This element has been notably absent in terms of the developments in question.

Secondly, one would have to question the wisdom of a community such as Happy Valley-Goose Bay placing all its hopes in another military activity

Roche, Sub:

when a change in NATO policy could lead to a reduced demand for low level flight training.

The Landry report itself hints at the tentative nature of the project, when it admits that while the training program is expected to continue indefinitely, the introduction of yet-to-be developed weapons systems could make obsolete the need for low level flight training.

As witnessed in the news last week, this dependence on military industry is already having a negative impact on other sectors of the economy. It was reported that one of the local outfitter companies was facing a drastic reduction in numbers of customers served because of the reluctance of people to vacation in an area of military training. If the present limited military training activities are having such an impact now, it would be reasonable to suggest that the proposed military developments would have a much greater negative impact.

Finally, the prospect of further military projects in the area raises the question of how one understands the concept of development. It seems to me that there is a great difference between how the Innue view development, and how this concept is understood by others, especially those most in favour of the projects.

To highlight the difference, I would like to paraphrase comments I heard recently made by

Roche, Sub:

a provincial politician in this regard. In this statement the individual compared the rivers of Labrador to, and I quote, "millions of barrels of oil flowing out into the ocean - wasted" in that they could be producing hydro-electric power which could be sold for a great profit. Within such a view, development really means the exploitation of natural resources and it has been this understanding of development which has here and elsewhere led to inhuman exploitation and to activities which ultimately are destructive of human dignity.

The comments of the politician referred to above are in complete contradiction to the notion of development as I have experienced it among the Innu. Development would seem to mean for them something to do with people first and not profits. Development is seen to be something which will benefit the people, the community, which will mean human development. Once this is grasped, it seems to me that it helps one to understand the Innu opposition to the military training activities.

Effects on wildlife: In this regard I do not pretend to have any expertise but I did find it interesting, in reviewing sections of the Report of the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry, to find a section of the report concentrated on the effects of aircraft on mammals and birds. In my reading of the report by Colonel Landry I felt that he tended to

Roche, Sub:

minimize the possible effects of military training activities on wildlife. I find this disturbing when I read in the opening sentences of Chapter 20 of the Pipeline Inquiry the following quotation:

> "The adverse effects of aircraft on mammals and birds have been described strongly and unequivocally by many biologists who presented evidence to the Inquiry...
>
> Their overriding concern focused on the effects of low-level flight by helicopters and fixed wing aircraft."

Given the high regard in which this Berger Inquiry is held, I think it would be logical to assume that these same biologists, in examining the effects of low level flight training on birds and mammals, would express at least equal if not greater concern.

The report goes on to say that uncontrolled aircraft flights are probably the most serious form of disturbance of mammals and birds. I would think that, given the nature of the military training activities, they would fall within this category of uncontrolled flight.

In examining the effects on caribou, the report states that, and I quote, "Low-level flight elicits panic responses from caribou". It goes on to outline the more immediate injurious consequences

Roche, Sub:

but concludes that, "The long term and more subtle effects of aircraft disturbance cannot be predicted at this time".

In light of these concerns, the report recommended very strict restraints on aircraft flights. It called for sensitive staging areas to be avoided, for example, and indicated that measures should be taken to establish strictly regulated flight corridors. It also established minimum altitude levels for aircraft. For example, in terms of mammals, it recommends a minimum altitude of 2,000 feet above ground level wherever there are calving caribou. During the fall staging of geese, the report calls for the avoidance of staging areas and calls upon all aircraft to maintain altitudes of 5,000 feet above ground level. In the introduction to this section on Restraints on Aircraft Flights, it states that a minimum flight altitude should be established at 1,500 feet above ground level.

I mention these guidelines because they would seem to call into question some of the practices present and proposed within the military training activities. In light of the suggested minimum flight altitude of 1,500 feet, it is interesting to note that the promotional pamphlet produced by DND states:

> "From Goose Bay, aircraft can fly as low as 100 metres from the ground almost anywhere in the interior. In addition,

Roche, Sub:

> there are two large, low level training areas totalling 100,000 square kilometres, for flying as low as 50 metres from the ground."

And, finally, in the project description released to the Panel, we read that:

> "Approximately 25,000 square miles of airspace would be required. This should ideally be reserved up to 50,000 feet and permit flying at supersonic speeds down to 50 feet above ground level."

I would suggest that the difference that exists between the recommendations of the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry on aircraft control and the practices both present and proposed of military training aircraft from Goose Bay are irreconcilable.

Future developments within the project: The draft guidelines specify that the proponent should identify probable developments within the project. Considering the scale and sophistication of the project, I feel that this cannot be overemphasized. Having tried to find information on other similar training centres, it would seem to me that the effects of certain improvements and the construction of sophisticated training equipment has led elsewhere to increases in

Roche, Sub:

supersonic and low level flights which exceeds the initial plans.

We have already witnessed here how there have been developments within military training activities in that we have seen a progression from bombing ranges with cold smoke devices to planned ranges for live weapons. Every effort should be taken to try to anticipate what further developments will follow.

DND states that it will require at least one Air Combat Manoeuvering Range/Instrumented. Having read some of the promotional material from the corporation which produces this defence system, I have learned that there are 12 such installations in the world. In several cases environmental assessments have been done on the possible implementation of these systems, particularly in the United States, and I would urge the Panel to include a study of these reports in its assessment. From what I have read, although I have not been able to verify this, it would seem to me that the range planned for Ntesinan would be the largest and most sophisticated of its type in the world.

The Draft Guidelines for this assessment also recognize the potential difficulties presented by sonic booms associated with the exercises. I would bring it to the attention of the Panel that environmental impact statements relating to supersonic

Roche, Sub:

flight have been done, namely in New Mexico, Texas and Nevada. I feel that it would be valuable to incorporate these as well into any EIS that will be provided.

Access to information: Any good reflection on the proposed military training activities will require a more detailed description of the project and a clearer description of probable developments than has yet been provided. The availability of such information has been, in my opinion, an on-going problem.

Until DND released its project description to the Assessment Panel, there was virtually no written material outlining the project except for the promotional material already mentioned. This lack of information and hesitancy to provide it on the part of DND is spoken to in a letter of the LIA in September of 1985 to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. It states that in the five years that have passed since the start of German low level flight training, the LIA has said that it has tried to get straight answers from DND and to get them to consult about new plans and proposals. It goes on to say that none of this worked.

> "In fact trying to get DND to commit itself to direct and up front dealing has been like trying to nail jelly to a

Roche, Sub:

tree."

Attempts by the Innu to obtain information on planned military training activities have also met with similar difficulties. In fact, in one response to a request, the commanding officer suggested that this was the same kind of information that Eastern Bloc Air Attachees in Ottawa were seeking. The suggestion, I feel, is that any attempt, therefore, to seek information can be considered a treasonable offence.

In trying to prepare this presentation and to check out material in the past week, I met with similar difficulties. On Thursday, September the 11th, I called Canadian Forces Station Goose Bay in an effort to seek some further information on the project description. I was transferred to three different lines and was finally passed on to a Lieutenant in the Public Relations Office. He informed me that no written material was available and that I would have to come into the base and seek out individuals who could respond to my questions. When I indicated to him that I was ready to come in that day, he responded that it would be eight days before he would have time to meet with me.

Similarly, last Friday I attempted to check out the accuracy of parts of my presentation by calling the office of the Director of Air Plans in Ottawa. I was told that the office was in the process

Roche, Sub:

of being moved or renovated and that it was impossible for me to speak to anyone. When I persisted, indicating that waiting until next week would be too late, the receptionist made no effort at all to be of assistance.

These two accounts may sound trivial, but I mention them because it is incidents such as these that tend to be the rule and not the exception.

Finally, through someone who was able to get through to the Director of Air Planning, I have learned that the details of the proposed NATO base are described in a 120-page NATO document. I would like to make a formal request at this time that this document or those sections of it that are not classified be made available.

Finally, I would like to close by presenting the Catholic Church's position on the proposed developments. The position of the Catholic Church concerning the present and proposed military training activities is revealed in a number of documents and texts.

In November of 1985, Bishop Adolphe Proulx, representing the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops before the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, indicated their concern about, and I quote, "...and apparent trend toward increasing military operations affecting the homeland of Native peoples in northern Canada". He went on to

Roche, Sub:

say that the flight testing of aircraft in Labrador and Quebec is one example which raises, and I quote, "Some serious ethical questions about northern development and policies".

The clearest statement of the Church's position is contained in the Project North release entitled, "The Emerging Militarization of Ntesinan". While the Church recognizes the severe economic recession which affects this area and while it is aware of the needs and hopes of all of the people of the regions, it states that, "Economic development must be just". On this basis the Church stands by the Innu in their request that Canada withdraw its offer of Ntesinan to NATO for the Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre, to rescind any bilateral international agreements and to refrain from any further agreements for the military use of the Innu homeland.

There are probably a number of other issues which could be addressed at this time. For example, the rights of Aboriginal peoples, the upcoming Human Rights Report, as well as Canada's Defence Policy and the question of continued participation in NATO, but I feel I have already taken a large block of time and I would like to give others the chance to speak.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak and for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Father Roche.

May we have our next speaker, when you are ready, please?

MR. PENASHUE: The next speaker will be Simon Michel.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. SIMON MICHEL: I would like to ask some questions of the Panel. You see our land on your way over, you must have seen our land from the road. You could have seen some of the damages of a recent forest fire. This is our land, this is not Canada's land. The Innu own this land. We have inherited it from our forefathers. I remember my grandfather and I remember some of the elders and we always wanted to use the land like our forefathers have. We never intended our land to be used a military training areas.

When Goose Bay was built, we never were aware that it was for a military purpose. We knew vaguely that it was going to be used as some kind of training but, for example, today, without even consulting the Innu, there is already word that some people have expressed in other parts of the world that we have already agreed to the land being used for military training. How can you not understand us, we have expressed our views on this thing for many years. You must understand our concerns.

Our land is despicable. We can already see the dangers and you may be the only ones that will like the kinds of development that will take

S. Michel, Sub:

place. The government always acts without any consultation with anyone, until after the government finishes its plan for any activity. Then, it starts to -- why can the government not find another area where the government can use it as a training area for military purposes. They should not use our land as a military base. This is still used by our people for means of survival. We see already the perils that we are going to find ourselves in.

I just wanted to express my views. That is all I can say at this time.

MR. PENASHUE: The next speaker is Lyla MacEachern(Andrew). Lyla, could you speak slow, please, because they are trying to translate.

---SUBMISSION BY MRS. LYLA ANDREW:

My name is Lyla Andrew. I want to make a statement to this Panel because I feel that I have a knowledge that very few non-Innu have regarding Innu and their opposition to increased military activities in their land, Ntesinan.

I feel a strong need to speak out because I hear so many non-Innu speaking about Innu and this issue and I feel that almost always their remarks and opinions are based on ignorance. I have lived in Sheshatshit for almost 10 years. During these years I have been privileged to live with Innu families in the country. Most recently, this past spring, I was in the country with my family and four

Andrew, Sub:

other families at Andrews Lake. The months I have spent living in the country and my experience of living and working in this community helps me to speak with the knowledge that, I think, few Innu possess.

The first remark I make is with regard to this whole preparation — this whole process of the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec. There is an assumption made that this material that is put forth in the Guidelines is available to everyone, Innu and non-Innu alike, that with equal skill and ability these Guidelines and this whole process can be shared and evaluated and worked through by everyone. This is just not true.

Secondly, an assumption is made that the stakes at risk on the outcome of this whole process are the same for Innu and non-Innu alike. This also is not true. Innu are a very knowledgeable, skilled people. If they had not been so knowledgeable, the Europeans who colonized Ntesinan would never have survived. To this day this knowledge is inextricably bound to living in Ntesinan.

The knowledge Innu possess has been learned not in schools but by living in Ntesinan. Therefore, the majority of Innu are at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to this type of process. No matter how eloquent and knowledgeable their statements of life in the country may be, this process

Andrew, Sub:

does not see them as the experts. What they know better than any others is not given the same importance as the testimony of so-called experts.

I tried to explain to a gentleman in Goose Bay a few months ago what it was like to be overflown while living in the country. He said Innu -- because he lived in Spruce Park in Goose Bay and jets were overflying all the time. I submit the comparison simply cannot be made.

In my opinion the Innu are the technical specialists, as defined on page 3 of the Guidelines, when it comes to knowledge of Ntesinan before the military began to use their land and since this has been on-going. At present, the Guidelines do not take account of this fact and, in my opinion, this is an obvious error.

In outlining the issues for analysis by the Panel, on page 13 of the Guidelines, I find the Panel referring to subsistence lifestyle. I assume that by subsistence lifestyle the Guidelines are referring to the lifestyles of the Innu who live as families for months of the year in Ntesinan. The use of this word "subsistence" carries much meaning, I think. It is defined in my dictionary as "merely enough to provide the bare necessities of life".

I know from living in the country that we live an incredibly rich life in every sense, emotionally, socially and physically. The contrast

Andrew, Sub:

between how people live in this village and in the country is startling. In many ways it is like a transformation from people who merely seem to exist here in the village but are truly alive in the country. The often overwhelming social problems facing Innu living in the village are not present in the country. Yet, make no mistake, the life in the country is not a rich sportsman's holiday. Everyone has responsibilities and everyone works hard because the environment demands it. No one who has not experienced this life can really measure the value of this living.

To call it subsistence living is to denegrate the rich, full life of the country and, more importantly, it serves to make it easier for non-Innu to say that, if this lifestyle has to be sacrificed for the majority, for the non-Innu population in Goose Bay and regions, then that is a sacrifice that has to be made. Since it is only subsistence living, it cannot be as valued anyway as the work-for-a-wage lifestyle.

This whole process really comes down to this issue: Whose lifestyles are more valued; who, as a people, are more valued? In the past, it has been quite clear that, as a people, the Innu have been the least important. My father-in-law, Mathew Ben Andrew, died several years ago. His land, his place in Ntesinan which he considered the heritage for his

Andrew, Sub:

children and grandchildren, was in the area flooded over and today still under water because of the Churchill Falls hydro project. Other Innu who shared this area in Ntesinan lost canoes, traps and other supplies because they were never even informed that this so-called development was going to happen, much less be invited to take part in a process like this one to discuss what the outcomes and mitigative measures of such a project might be.

In my opinion, we have not come such a long way from those days, when a man's life, his heritage could be stolen from him with not a word. But my mother-in-law and her 15 children are still very much alive and the country life is still absolutely central to the family's life. This family is by no means unique among Innu.

Today we have a process for discussion but it is very much a process with a Catch-22 for the Innu. If they do not make speeches and show up in numbers, then it is construed that there is of little or no interest. What of the 200 Innu from Sheshatshit who are in the country today? Their interest in this whole issue is measured by the fact that they are living in the country today, passing on their values and skills to their children and grandchildren. They are not in the country because their leadership, the Innu who addressed you earlier today, tell them that it is politically wise to be in the country.

Andrew, Sub:

On the contrary. They are in the country because they have the need to be there. The desire to live that life is strong and this exists in spite of all the programs and projects which make it all the more difficult to live in the country.

In the end I think Innu know that it is not what they have to say which will make the difference. Your Guidelines do not even allow you to decide if all this overflying should stop. It seems clear this has been decided and that both levels of governments are actively encouraging it. I do not see that the rest of the scope of this project is such a separate issue, it is just much more of the same. It is clear from the destruction of the Innu culture which has already taken place since Innu were forced into a colonial relationship, that there can only follow further destruction of a unique culture that simply is not going to be able to withstand continued assaults from the outside.

Is there really a desire on the part of this Panel or either level of government to really appreciate and understand the value of the Innu culture? If so -- and that is an enormous "if" -- is there any will to change the whole colonizing process begun a few generations back and still continuing today? Because, if you do come to understand the value of this culture and the importance of the survival of the Innu as a people, then you have a duty

Andrew, Sub:

to advise the Canadian government that the increased militarization in any form of the Innu homeland must stop.

Thank you.

MR. PENASHUE: The next one on the list is Ponas Noke.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. PONAS NOKE:

Mr. Chairman, I am Ponas Noke. President and Chief, and Members of the Board of this meeting —I think I am going to need a translator because I would like to speak in Indian and some people have a bit of problem understanding in English.

I would like to say some of the things that we have already heard. I would like to bring some of you back to 1940 or 1941 or 1942. I was young then but these are things I was told. All these times I have heard about low level air flights and the Innu saying we do not like the low level aircraft. I believe that some of the Innu who are probably older than I am probably should remember back in 1941. Who was it -- probably the Innu who were involved in 1941 when the American Air Force came in and the Canadian Air Force and cleared for the runways and various military facilities. Innu people were not there as part of the labour force and they were willing to work there.

In 1950 the extension of the base, Northwest Point. Again, the Innu were employed as

Noke, Sub:

part of the team to work in the clearing of the base. Although there was no aircraft such as low level aircraft or military jets, there was still helicopter. In those years, most of the Innu, some of the Innu were probably involved in these job developments and at that time I did not hear the Innu speak of the concerns they are speaking now and there were twice as many, probably more aircraft at that time.

The Innu, at that time, never spoke of the concerns they now have about their hunting territories and so on in Labrador. This is a concern that I have.

I would like also to point out this winter...I do not know which one we are going to use. The low level aircraft are being a very great concern for the Innu but yet, at the same time, the Innu invite Greenpeace to their communities.

I have given some of the material to the Chairman regarding Greenpeace. The military aircraft and the military do not say to us, "Don't kill any wildlife". But Greenpeace, on the other hand, says with all the pamphlets, "This is the animals you should not kill, you should not take because of the various" -- Some of these leaders present here today are the ones that dealt with the Greenpeace. Now, which are we going to use today? Is it going to be the military we are going to choose or Greenpeace? In my opinion we take all animals; we fish, for example.

Noke, Sub:

Is that what we are going to be told? To first look at the blood of the animals that you are taking. This is the concern that I have when we are talking about the military and at the same time, in the same breath, we talk about Greenpeace and the military.

A long time ago, ever since I can remember, I have always been into the country. I do not think that there are no less animals today than there were back when I used to go out. My feeling is that there are more animals than there were at the times when I used to go. Twenty-five years ago, I remember, sometimes the Innu families were almost starving. Today there are more animals and there are not people today who are starving when they go to the country. At that time there was no military aircraft.

I go to the country every year. I am not here to make some off-the-cuff remarks. I have been in the country every year. I know when the country is full of wildlife.

Thank you.

MR. PENASHUE: The next speaker is Robert Lanari from Makivik.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. ROBERT LANARI:

Following an invitation we had from some people of this community and on behalf of Makivik, which is a non-profit organization representing the Inuit population of northern Quebec, I would like to address, at this point in time, two

Lanari, Sub:

points.

First, Makivik will be making a presentation to this Panel next Thursday in Kuujjuaq or Fort Chimo. We have comments on the project itself and on the Guidelines. So, I will spare you the details for now.

However, I would like simply to say that in northern Quebec we are extremely concerned with the environmental impacts of both aspects of the project, i.e. the bilateral agreement and the NATO aspect of it.

We are also concerned with the consultation process with the affected population. We are also very concerned with the monitoring of both aspects of the project and we are also very concerned with the economic impacts on all of northern Quebec of this project. As I said, these concerns will be dealt with more fully next Thursday.

The second point we would like to deal with on behalf of Makivik is that Makivik fully supports the Innu people in their quest for recognition of their Aboriginal rights and self-determination. Aboriginal rights and self-determination are fundamental issues and we are of the opinion that this Panel should deal with both of these issues.

Thank you very much.

MR. PENASHUE: The next speaker is

Andrew von Rhedey, Northern Perspective.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. ANDREW VON RHEDEY:

Mr. Chairman, members of the group, I am representing a group called Northern Perspective, which is a group consisting of a number of communities and social groups in Labrador and Quebec and also a number of the businessmen in the business community in Labrador and Quebec who are not members of the Mokami project group. I am not saying that we represent all the other groups, I am saying that we are representing many groups who are not members of the Mokami project group.

However, before I start with our presentation, I wish to tell you a little bit about myself. I was born in Upper Hungary, a country which is now part of Czechoslovakia, a Communist country. I left Czechoslovakia during the Soviet occupation in 1968. The reason I am saying those things is because since I have been in Goose Bay, involved with this project, there were several innuendos made by a number of people that insinuate that I may have some ulterior motives of why I am involved with this presentation.

Anyway, in 1968, when I left Czechoslovakia during the Soviet invasion, I went through an intense examination through several political refugee camps in Italy. During and after those examinations, I was awarded a United Nations Political Refugee Status. In other words, I passed a

von Rhedey, Sub:

security clearance. Since that time, especially within the last four years living in Canada, I was trained and employed by the Surveillance Section of the Department of Fisheries as a scientific observor collecting scientific data within the 200 mile conservation zone, and also collecting commercial intelligence data for the federal government. That was my job.

During that time I was also spearheading an internal investigation into the various misrepresentations and wrong-doings by the Department of Fisheries itself. Eventually, this investigation expanded to a number of areas. It was conducted by the RCMP and Canadian Security Service and is still on-going. Since and as a result of that investigation, over 120 or 140 civil servants have been laid off, fired and shuffled to other departments. Anyway, I am not here to speak because of that but I am just giving a clarification that my reasons for being here are strictly of a concern because of what is happening in Labrador and are not of a clandestine nature.

This is the presentation that was published on September 10th, 1986 and is a brief on the present low level flying and the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Labrador and northern Quebec. It is put out by the Northern Perspective Project, Labrador -- I should say, Labrador and northern Quebec: Room to fly, ready for NATO.

von Rhedey Sub:

NATO is looking for a site for a large Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre. In attempting to secure this establishment for Canada, the Canadian military is engaged in a sophisticated selling campaign directed towards the NATO extolling the virtues of Goose Bay, the rest of Labrador and northern Quebec. This compaign is based on our experience with certain NATO countries already flying in the area under bilateral agreements. I will quote:

> "Goose Bay has everything NATO needs. Surrounded by the wilderness airspace, excellent flying weather and the comprehensive infrastructure, Goose Bay is the ideal location for a NATO training Centre. Located less than five hours flying from Europe lies the Goose Bay airfield. Goose Bay owes its origin to the Second World War, as their escalated base became a landing field and fuelling stop for the North Atlantic ferry route."

The Canadian Department of National Defence states, although Goose Bay is a civilian airfield at the present time, a great deal of military activity is evident. Their air force also flies Phantoms and Buccaneers at Goose Bay and, as a regular user of the airfield is the German Air Force, Luftwaffe.

von Rhedey, Sub:

Since 1981 the German F-4 Phantoms and Alpha Jets have taken advantage of the relatively restriction-free area to conduct low level flying training. The first detachment of German Tornado aircraft began training in Goose Bay in the summer of 1985. The Canadian military further states, "In Europe aircraft are virtually unable to conduct any beneficial low level tactical training due to the numerous population centres and other sensitive areas". However, they failed to say that in Europe there is a strong opposition to this type of military activity and the European NATO governments which wish to continue this type of activity are forced to seek replacement training areas to ease their own domestic political pressures.

Therefore, as a selling point, the Department of National Defence stresses, I quote: "From Goose Bay aircraft can fly as low as 100 metres from the ground almost anywhere in the interior, and two areas for tactical flying as low as 50 metres". By a self-assessment procedure which the Canadian Environmental Assessment Review Process appears to have allowed, the Canadian military decided that there was no need for any public review of the impacts to the environment in the establishment of these two tactical flying areas which total over 100,000 square kilometres and include a bombing range. Nor, any need for a public review of the impact of all the bilateral von Rhedev, Sub:

agreements signed to date. No doubt this freedom to operate suitably impresses the European customers.

In further selling the area, Canadian military states, "To give an idea of the airspace available at Goose Bay, it is possible to fit Belgium, a country of approximately 12 million people, into a larger of two low level training areas. Labrador alone is bigger than the British Isles, one-third larger than Germany, about the same size as Italy and twice the size of Greece. Surely, this is an ideal location to carry out productive, realistic tactical fighter training".

These types of presentations give our readers the idea that the vastness of Labrador may safely support this type of environmental abuse. The need for presenting this particular perspective of Labrador has become obvious. When we look to another DND document, it outlines the requirements for the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. I quote, "Approximately 25,000 square miles of airspace for tactical operations, including AACT, should be ideally be reserved up to 50,000 feet and permit flying at supersonic speeds down to 50 feet AGL". Also, the additional requirements are at least one air combat manoeuvering range, instruments for air combat training over a tactical air-to-surface range with a representative array to provide realistic training in a tug and strike weapon event.

von Rhedey, Sub:

Sea range with facilities at sea provide for weapons training and air-to-air range for gunnery training and missile firing. All of this, incidentally, required by the military repeatedly and publicly promised the local population in attempting to win their support for the base that there would be no live weapons training associated with any increased military activities in this area.

The military ultimately envision, and I quote, "An activity rate of 200 sorties a day of 140 aircraft flying at low level at supersonic speeds."

The people and the environment: Labrador and northern Quebec is a home to several thousand Innu and Inuit people. These people, at present, are involved in a land claims negotiation with the federal government. They hope to preserve their heritage and to secure some control over their land, which was never surrendered during the phase of European colonization. Now, this is not our opinion, this is an historical fact.

There are no treaties between Labrador Native people and Canada which would legitimize this intrusion into their land. Labrador and northern Quebec is also a home to the world's largest caribou herd The most recent census indicates that the herd is about 586,000 strong. This is a part of what is written here. From examining many DND documents, one would get the impression that DND is taking the credit for this

von Rhedey, Sub:

increase. I am just wondering if they ever tried to examine or study, taking a scientific approach, in mass multiplication rather than as the bull being stimulated by the low level flying.

Recent observations by hunters, trappers and live observers revealsome alarming trends. Together with a scientific observation, this evidence indicates that there is a definite change in migration patterns of Labrador caribou. Biologists have learned that caribou, which usually enter certain areas in great numbers, now are avoiding the same areas. These areas are now used or being used by low level flying.

Caribou is a staple food for many of the people of Labrador and especially the Innu who spend a large part of their lives or their time living outside of settlements. Low level flying areas are also located over the nesting grounds of many species of migratory birds. Now, I will quote, "I believe the implementation of the plan will be towards the conserving continental water fowl in the wetlands. Its success will have dependence and support of all the levels of government, the private sector and individuals interested in developing this valuable shared resource." This was said by Tom MacMillan, Federal Minister of the Environment, emphasizing the significance of the North American Water Fowl and Management Plan.

As of today, there have been no studies

von Rhedey, Sub:

conducted on the impact of low level flying on the Canada geese of Labrador by a Canadian Wildlife Service or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Most wildlife biologists would agree that a meaningful study of this population would take at least five years. Such a study is not presently taking place nor, to the best of our knowledge, is one planned.

Considering that this is a large megaproject affecting at least 100,000 square kilometres with a great deal of wildlife under international protection, such a lack of concern on the part of the monitoring agency is alarming.

According to the earlier study, as outlined in "Ducks, Geese and Swans of North America", 1976 edition, Canada geese were divided into 12 specific population ranges. The Canada geese of Labrador were included with the North Atlantic group. These population numbers at that time was 35,000 in the winter. Winter area for North American Atlantic group are on the Atlantic coast from southern Newfoundland through the Maritimes, Long Island and New Jersey. Any impact on this small group, especially on its breeding range and its migration, would have devastating consequences. Also, any negative changes to this group would not only affect Labrador and the Maritime provinces but also several U.S. states where these birds winter.

With no data to dispute the original

von Rhedey, Sub:

grouping -- I am talking about the 1976 grouping -- with regard to the North Atlantic group, in the November 1985 draft of the North American Water Fowl and Management Plan, the Canadian Wildlife Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reclassified the North American population ranges. The North Atlantic group of 35,000 birds, Canada geese, Newfoundland and Labrador, was joined with the Mid-Atlantic group of 650,000 birds, Canada geese. The boundary of the Mid-Atlantic group ranged from the western Labrador border to James Bay. Now, both areas have become the Atlantic group.

This union of these two groups give the appearance that the North American/Maritime Canada geese population is large, over 700,000. Removing 35,000 or even 50,000 or more birds from it would still leave the public with the impression that the group was healthy. Any damage resulting from low level flying would be hidden in the large numbers.

In addition to concern about the Labrador caribou and migratory bird populations, no work has been done on the affects of massive river valley flying on the fur bearing population of those valleys nor on the effects of the jet engine emission on salmon spawning grounds in the rivers overflown.

The Environmental Review Process, as presently constituted, calls for the studies on these problems to be completed and the evidence presented by von Rhedev, Sub:

November 1987. The obvious haste with which the presence is being conducted reflects the Canadian military's desire to have this base established. I will quote:

> "It is also important that our decision be timely. We are committed to increase flying next year and NATO will expect us to be prepared to respond promptly to any invitation to host a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. To this end, I trust their due process can be completed expeditiously."

Letter from the Associate Minister of National Defence, Harvey André, to Thomas MacMillan, Minister of the Environment, requesting an environmental review on the 13th of February, 1986.

Such haste, however, guarantees that many of the problems cannot be adequately studied and some of the major problems will not be studied at all. At the very least, the Environmental Review Process should be extended for a far greater time than is presently planned.

Conclusion: About 36,000 people live in Labrador in 31 communities. The regions suffer from chronic unemployment and is politically isolated. As with many rural areas, information about what is happening at the national/international level is not really available as in the southern more populated

von Rhedey, Sub:

regions. Information horizons shrink in northern rural areas. Therefore, there is a tendency among the white populations to concentrate solely on the local issues with economic survival being the main issue for most of the white population and the realization that government money, in one form or another, is what keeps the region alive.

The white population is most concerned with the possibility of employment. While some people have raised concerns locally, it tends to be drowned out by businesses and the government's spokespersons. People's concerns about the employment are real and valid. The concerns, however, make them vulnerable to the promises of employment. It also stands to reinforce in peoples' minds the positive aspects of the base and tends to less in their minds the negative aspects.

Given the understandable concerns people have about their economic security, it is to be assumed that the local non-Native support for the base will continue. While they feel the base should be opposed, we also feel that more should be done to lessen, not strengthen, the region's dependency on the military.

The issues associated with this base extend around the world and should be looked at and debated by a far greater group of people than is presently dealing with it. There will inevitably be

von Rhedey, Sub:

many different points of view towards this development but we feel that at present not enough people are aware of the magnitude and the scope of this development to allow a hasty and ill-informed decision to be made serving the interests of the small groups of people when compared to the numbers of people and the environment that the base will ultimately affect.

In closing, I also have the schedule of the Labrador and northern Quebec military activities, as well as the Canada goose population as of the 1976 consensus.

This is my presentation. Thank you.

MR. PENASHUE: The next one will be Mary Ann Michel.

Mr. Chairman, what time to you usually close? Should I invite some other people to speak?

THE CHAIRMAN: The scheduled time to close the meeting is ten o'clock. I know of one other speaker who would like to have something to say. So, I would like to leave some time for him.

MR. PENASHUE: Okay.

---SUBMISSION BY MARY ANN MICHEL:

...the only job that the Innu received were axes and shovels. I have seen Goose Bay since it was started. I was growing up then. I remember Goose Bay very well. It is always like this. The white people always sit in front of us looking for our land, wanting us to give up all our birthrights.

M.A. Michel, Sub:
We will never give up this land.

Do you have any shame that you should come to our land and face us like you are now requesting that we give up our land to you? You never, never stop what you are doing now, sitting in front of us trying to get our land. We will never give it up. I am very angry when I see white people, such as yourselves, looking for us to give up our birthright. I am very angry today. How many times have the Innu come to your land to look for land, to look for anything. Even the Innu, in its despicable condition, in its wretched condition never comes to you for anything.

Do you hate the Innu; do you want to kill the Innu? You have already killed us in many respects. We have nothing. No animals, there are no animals near us, and we cannot even drink our water. We cannot drink water, for example, in the river, what used to be our water source. There is no one who has clean water in his house until, in fact, sometimes our people go and get water from even, let us say, the priest's house. We are very poor, we do not have any water in our lakes and rivers any more. It has been many years since we have been able to get water from the river.

We have nothing. We have no wood. We do not burn any oil. We do not have any running water or furnaces in our house. Even wood is prevented from

M.A. Michel, Sub:

us. We cannot cut wood until we have a permit. We cannot cut wood without a permit. Animals, partridge, all kinds of animals, rabbit, all of these animals we have to buy licences for. If we do not have the licence we would always be in jail. Look at our situation. Would you like to be in that kind of position? I submit you probably would not like to be in those conditions.

If there was a military base here there would be no jobs for the Innu, only non-Innu would qualify for jobs. For instance, the Innu cannot go to the government and get even welfare. People have to make their living now from the country. In the country people always have plenty to eat. They have plenty of caribou meat, they can take 10 caribou at a time. The Innu are very rich when they live in the country.

The reason we are in this condition is because of the jealousy that is perpetrated by those who... I wish that we could all be friends. I wish we could all be living together and loving all over the world. God gave us the land and we are destroying it. It is a shame that all of us are -- we are all going to die when there is war. All of them; the animals and ourselves. The animal is not going to be the only one that will get killed.

The doctor, for example, cannot even cure many of the diseases we have today. All of the

M.A. Michel, Sub:

hospitals, for example, are closed. There is no one to help us now. We are very poor. For instance, look at the hospital. Our hospital, for example, that is closed. What about the animals and the Innu? All of us are going to be affected because of our jealousies and because of our anger at each other. I am always bothered and concerned by the facts of our situation today.

If only God could help us to love each other and to even stop war. Maybe that is our prayer.

MR. PENASHUE: I have no one else on my list.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other speakers from the community, because I know of only one more speaker who has asked me if he can speak.

If there are no other speakers from the community, then perhaps we can hear from that last person and we will be finished.

MR. PENASHUE: Colonel John David.

---SUBMISSION BY COLONEL JOHN DAVID:

Panel, Peter, thank you very much. I wish to cover a couple of questions that were brought out today that I feel obligated, as the military leader in the area, to explain to the people here and to clarify something that I think is important to all of us.

The first point I would like to say, Father Roche, I think you and I need to go in the

David, Sub:

confession booth for a while and talk to each other because you know that you have always been welcome to come and talk to me about concerns or about areas that you have needed information on, and I am sorry that you did not make an effort to contact me for the information or leave a message because I can assure that Michel and Daniel and Greg can get a hold of me in much less than eight days' notice, if it is that important. I just want to make that very clear, that there is no effort on our part to hold back information to this community or for anything that you may need or want.

I would like to offer now that, if you have more concerns as we go on, the person that you need to contact -- you can do it through me, if it has to do with Training Centre problems or future plans -- is Major McCabe here. He is the expert. So, no matter where you go or what you do, it is all going to end up on his desk and he is going to have to find the answers for you. Even I do not have the answers, he is supposed to know. So, please make use of that.

I just want to let you know that you are always welcome and you can come and talk to me with Father Donovan or Father Reg McKenna anytime when you need the information.

The other point that I just wanted to bring up is a very serious point. There was an allegation this afternoon that the military were

David, Sub:

involved in sexual abuse in this community. Now, a few months ago -- six or so months ago, there was a program where, I believe, Peter Penashue made reference to illegitimate children, without any presentation to me or to any officials at the station. I, on my own, went to Social Services, to the Grenfel Health Association medical people and the RCMP to look into this matter because it is of great concern to me that anything like this should happen.

The result was that there were no indications or no documented evidence in the past thre years of this. The bottom line is, if there is anything like that in the community, whether it be military or not, it is something that cannot be condoned under any circumstances. If you or your leaders know of anything like that that has occurred or is occurring, I need to know about it immediately because that is not acceptable in anybody's society.

What the Social Services people told me, and the doctors at the hospital told me, is that abuse in the communities, not just the Native communities but in all the communities, 99 per cent of it was related to alcohol and that a high percentage of it was within the family units themselves. The response to me was there was no documented evidence of this.

I was a bit aghast to hear that or reference to it today because, if it is a factor, then I want to take, and I will take, further steps

David, Sub:

immediately tomorrow to have it further researched because I cannot, as a military leader, accept anything that would be implied, in terms of military people, or imposed upon your community.

The other point I would just like to say is that I would like to congratulate Mrs. Michel for getting up as the only Native woman in the community to speak here tonight,and let her frustrations out. It was very interesting for me to hear that, unequivocally.

I thank you for allowing me to come here and I thank you for sharing your food with me tonight. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colonel David.

I do not know of any other person who wishes to speak tonight but I will allow one more chance at this point for anyone who feels that they would like to say something to this Panel because we have lots of time left. Here is your last chance.

This Panel has come a long distance from several different locations to hear you and to hear people in other communities near here. So, while we are here we would like to hear from you. Please come forward, if you wish.

If not, then, I suppose it is time to close the meeting. I would like to thank all of you for coming and I would especially like to thank those of you who have come forward and spoken to us. I woul like to thank the leaders of the community, in particular Mr. Bart Jack, and all of the others who have shown us warm hospitality and provided us with a meal.

I would like to thank the members of the Secretariat to the Panel, as well as our audio technician, Mr. Sicoli, and to all of those who have provided us with interpretation services here this evening and today.

I would encourage you all to keep up your interest in the project. If you wish to get on our mailing list for information about the review, then please do so by speaking to the Secretariat. If there are indications of continuing interest from here, then we will certainly be back in the next round of meetings as part of this review.

Again, thank you very much. Would you please turn in your translation receivers on your way out.

Thank you very much.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Volume

9

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	NORTH WEST RIVER	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 14, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	9	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: The Lion's Club, North West River

DATE: October/octobre 14, 1986.

VOLUME: 9

INDEX

	PAGE
Presentation by The Chairman	801
Presentation by Major David McCabe	816

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Dr. Maureen Baikie	826
Katherine Baikie-Pottle	827
Albert Michelin	829
David Paddon	834
Dr. Maureen Baikie	838
Millicent Loder	848
Katherine Baikie-Pottle	855
Colonel John David	861

* * * * *

---Upon Commencing at 7:35 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming out to the meeting. My name is David Barnes, I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, seated at the head table. Our apologies, although it is not our fault, to those of you who came here very early tonight. I understand that one of the news media announced that the meeting was going to start at 7:00 o'clock. In fact, the announcement that we published some time ago stated quite clearly that the starting time for the meeting tonight was to be 7:30. We are sorry that you had to wait so long.

This Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review into certain proposed and existing military flying activities occurring over parts of Labrador and Quebec. We have come here this evening to talk with you about the project, about our review of the project and to listen to whatever you wish to say to us related to that review.

I would first like to introduce to you the other Members of the Panel. Starting at the end of the table to your left, that is down that way, is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position before his retirement was as Deputy Commander of one of the regions of NORAD. He is living in the Ottawa area at the present time where he operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist with extensive experience with wildlife in Newfoundland and Labrador. He was at one time employed with the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. He now lives in St. John's where he is Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm.

To my left is Mr. Tim McNeill, who is probably well known to many of you. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business and he is on the Panel because of his knowledge of the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. William Jourdain who lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. Mr. Jourdain has been active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in certain commercial interests in Sept-Iles. Prior to his retirement he worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada for about 20 years.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked quite extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of northern Quebec. He is a consultant established in Montreal where he lives and has been involved in negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

I work in the Federal Environmental

Assessment Review Office, an agency of the Federal Government, located in Ottawa where, for about one year, I have been Director for the Atlantic Region. Prior to that, I was employed for about 11 years with the Environment Department of Newfoundland Public Service.

To help you understand a bit more of the review that we are involved in here, I would like to briefly outline the process that we are going through in this review. In February of 1986 the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment indicating that it had a proposal to continue with certain low level flying activities being carried on out of Goose Bay under agreements with certain NATO allies and also a proposal to establish a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for training NATO forces at Goose Bay.

It said to the Minister of the Environment that it would wish to have a public review of this proposal initiated. In accordance with the process that is known as the Environmental Assessment Review Process, the Minister appointed the Panel as you see before you in July of this year and gave it a mandate which is known as the Terms of Reference and which has been distributed quite widely to persons in this community as well as elsewhere. A copy of that document is available to anybody who would care to see it.

One of the first tasks that the Panel

had to do was to identify the issues that need to be examined in this review and, having done that, to prepare a document to serve as instructions to the Department of National Defence in carrying out its part in the review and in preparing one of the key documents of that review; that is an Environmental Impact Statement. These instructions are to be contained in a document which are known in our process as Guidelines.

So, in August of this year the Panel published those Guidelines in draft form and had them distributed to everybody on our mailing list, as it was established at that time, and it has certainly been distributed to other parties since then.

We are presently in the process of carrying out a series of public meetings in 17 locations throughout Quebec and Labrador, as well as in Montreal and St. John's, to listen to what interested parties have to say about the contents of that draft. We wish them to tell the Panel how they feel about the draft, whether it is adequate, whether it needs to be amended, improved in one way or another. At the end of these meetings the Panel will sit down and look at all the information coming out of the transcripts of the meetings and coming out of presentations that will have been made in writing to the Panel and decide what needs to be done to the draft to make it the best set of guidelines that we can possibly make them, given the information that we have at our disposal.

We expect to have the final form of the Guidelines ready to be presented to the Department of National Defence in December of this year. When it receives those Guidelines that Department will begin to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement which will involve collecting a great mass of existing information, perhaps collecting some new information through original studies that may be necessary, and, in accordance with the contents of the Guidelines document, preparing the Impact Statement. We expect that that Impact Statement should be ready to be presented to the Panel sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

The Impact Statement will immediately be made available to the public and there will be a period of time of several months allowed during the summer and early fall of 1987 for the review of this document by the Panel, by appropriate departments of government, by the public and any other interested parties.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is it meets the requests of the Panel as contained in the Guidelines document, the Panel will announce public hearings to be held to discuss the project. The most likely time for those hearings to be held, as we see it now, is the fall of 1987.

After the hearings, the final step in the process will be the preparation by the Panel of its report to the government containing a discussion of the project, the expected impacts on the environment, possible remedial measures to deal with those impacts and recommendations to the government on the two major components on the proposal, as I outlined earlier. The Panel expects to be able to present that report to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence sometime late in 1987 or early 1988.

Now, it may be that some of you have not had an opportunity to look at the Guidelines document itself. So, to help you become familiar with its purpose and content, I will briefly go through some of the highlights with you.

After some definitions at the front and also an introductory section, the Guidelines set out the scope for the review stating at the beginning that the Guidelines apply to the entire project, including all activities associated with its construction, operation, maintenance, possible termination and demobilization. In accordance with the manner in which the project has been described to us by the Department of National Defence, we are asking that the review treat the project as having two components, as I mentioned before: The on-going low level flight training that has been carried out since 1980 and, on the other hand, the establishment and operations of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for training NATO air forces at Goose Bay.

We state that the EIS -- that is the Environmental Impact Statement -- should, as far as possible, deal with the impacts of the two components separately. But, at the same time, it should also point out any linkages or interrelationships between them, especially if those interactions might lead to additive or cumulative impacts on the environment.

The next section of the Guidelines gives some instructions to the proponent, that is the Department of National Defence, on how to go about conducting its studies, its review. We point out quite clearly that the Impact Statement should not attempt to be an encyclopaedia of all that is known about the study area. Rather than that, the Panel has identified certain issues that need to be addressed and analyzed in the Impact Statement and the investigation of the environment should be focused and related to those issues.

Another important point in the method section is that we expect the proponent to treat the area that could be impacted as a total ecological system, including human populations and their social and cultural structures as a part of a great life support system composed of air, water, minerals, soil, plant, animals, et cetera, all of which function together and interrelate to maintain the whole.

The Panel has so far identified nine

(Page 809 follows...)

issues which we believe are important to be addressed in the study. I am going to read each of these for you so that you can hear each one and understand the Panel's thinking at the present time.

The first issue we have identified is the effects of low-flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife;

Number two: The effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use;

Number three: The opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the project area;

Number four: The impacts of the project on renewable resource-based commercial activities. One example being outfitters' companies.

Number five: The impacts on the natural environment of construction activities associated with expansion of Goose Bay Airport and impacts on the natural environment of exhaust emissions from increased flying activities;

Number six, which I have hinted at already: The cumulative effects of the project and of other projects and activities in the region;

Number seven: The need for monitoring of various parts of the project and its effects on the environment. This monitoring could be carried out, for example, during construction phases or during operational phases of the project, as well as during closedown, if that should come to pass.

Issue number eight: The impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges;

And number nine: The effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims.

It is important to note here that, while the Panel recognizes that it has not been asked to examine and deliberate on the policy of the Government of Canada in dealing with Native land claims, we feel that the issue of the possible effects of the project on the outcome of such negotiations is a real issue. It has been raised to us on several occasions and, therefore, needs to be examined.

The final section of the Guidelines provides more specific instructions to the proponent on the structure and the contents of the Impact Statement. In effect, what it does is lay out a suggested table of contents for the Impact Statement.

The first item would be a summary of the Impact Statement itself, which would draw together and consolidate the important findings of the Impact Statement. To point out to you the complexity of the situation that we are dealing with here, we are asking that that summary be published not only in English and French but also in sufficient languages and dialects to meet the needs of certain other groups which have interest in this, namely the Inuit of northern Quebec, the Inuit of Labrador, the Naskapi of Quebec, the Montagnais of Schefferville and the lower north shore of Quebec, and the Naskapi/Montagnais/ Innu of Labrador.

The next section deals with the setting for the project, a bit of the background. For example, the justification for the project itself; why is it needed. We feel that the Panel and the public need a better understanding of the justification and the rationale for the project to serve as a background through the examination of the issues that we have identified.

The proponent is expected to identify and describe all associated projects and activities, including ground and air base monitoring facilities, alternate landing strips, refuelling sites and to treat all of these in every respect as forming part of the project for the purposes of the Impact Statement.

Besides that, information on other existing planned or probable developments within any of the areas affected by the project must be presented in sufficient detail to permit the Panel to understand any cumulative impacts or interactions that may arise from them. This is to apply even if such projects do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of National Defence.

Some of the examples we have placed before them would be the North Warning Radar System, the commercial caribou hunts near Nain and Kuujjuaq, possible hyro-electric developments at Gull Island and

Muskrat Falls and the Trans-Labrador Highway.

Alternatives must be discussed. The proponent must describe the major alternatives to the project, such as alternative sites for runways and infrastructure, alternative flying areas, as well as the possibility of using flight simulators combined with low level flight training as a training aid.

A very important section in the Impact Statement would be the description of the project itself. There is already, of course, a project description as submitted to the Minister of the Environment in February. Beyond that, the Panel has identified that additional information is needed now to fully understand the project. The proponent has already been invited to supply this additional information. Some of it, in fact, we will hear this evening; some other information, I understand, is to be presented to the Panel in writing in the near future.

I will not go into any more detail on the sorts of project information we are looking for because we will, in a few minutes, hear a brief outline of the project itself. Suffice to say, at the moment, that we would ask it to be presented under three headings. First of all, the low level flight training that is on-going at the present time; secondly, the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre; and, thirdly, tactical weapons ranges. We have set that apart on its own because there may be a need for such ranges both under the present low level flying activity and under the proposed NATO Training Centre.

As part of the background information we are asking for in considering the effects of the project, we need a description of the existing environment. As I said before, we are not asking for a total description of the entire environment, we are asking that that description be based on the issues that the Panel has identified and that it be focused on those issues. The simple reason being that there may well be many aspects of the environment that will not be at all affected by this project.

Tape 4B

This description of the environment will serve as a context or a baseline description against which the impacts of the project can be identified and evaluated. This must include a survey of the aspirations, the hopes of the Native and non-Native residents of the areas of Labrador and Quebec that stand to be affected by the project.

The information would be presented, for example, under such headings as geology and geo-morphology, climate and air quality, water quality, fish, marine mammals, birds, terrestrial mammals and plants.

Turning to the socio-economic side of the picture, we would ask for a description of the social and economic conditions and for information on resource use. For example, the distribution and characteristics of the human populations of the area, the economic, cultural and social setting, the socio-economic impacts of the low level flight training since 1980, resource use in the area based on historic records, the existing situation and projected future use, information on travel and communications within the area on commercial aviation and on aircraft movements at Goose Bay Airport in each of the last six years.

We also wish to know about any areas that have special status, such as ecological reserves, sanctuaries, areas of archeological or historic importance and the like. We wish to have an understanding of the urban development plan for Happy Valley-Goose Bay and the status of land claims negotiations involving all Native groups.

The next section of the Impact Statement would describe the expected environmental and socio-economic impacts coming from the project. In particular, this section must include an analysis of the impacts of the termination or the suspension of the project should it initially be approved.

Having described the expected impacts, the developer would then be expected to put forward suggestions for mitigative measures, remedial measures, which would include those intended to enhance or prolong beneficial effects, as well as those to eliminate or reduce adverse effects. The proponent would be expected to identify clearly who will be responsible for individual mitigative measures or damages, including those that might be caused by personnel or equipment belonging to a non-Canadian organization.

It may be that there will be impacts for which no mitigating measures can be devised or there may be impacts that are left over after the successful application of mitigating measures. In either case those would be known as residual impacts and we expect a section of the Environmental Impact Statement to be devoted to those.

I mentioned monitoring a little earlier. There would have to be a section on this subject in the Impact Statement that would describe, estimate the cost and identify the responsibility for a program of monitoring designed to achieve at least the following three objectives: Number one, to test the validity and the accuracy of the predicted impacts; secondly, to identify and evaluate impacts that were not or could not be predicted in advance; and, thirdly, to test the effectiveness of the mitigative measures.

That, in brief, is an outline of this Guidelines document which we have drafted and published for your consideration. Are there any questions on the process or on the Guidelines before we go on any further?

Very well. I mentioned that we would hear something about the description of the project. It has become customary in any public meetings of this sort being held by panels that we invite along a representative of the proponent agency. In this case, with all of these meetings in this series, we are pleased to have Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence. If you are ready, we would like you to proceed and give us an outline of the project. Major McCabe is also prepared to answer questions after he is finished.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen. Good evening.

By way of a short introduction I would like to give a bit of my own background with this project. I spent the first two years of my military career as an air traffic controller in Goose Bay. Since then I have done some time flying as a fighter pilot and for the last two years I have been in Ottawa, initially as Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre and, subsequently, I have expanded my responsibilities to include all developments for Goose Bay for the future in the military sense.

As you know, Goose Bay Airport has had a constant military presence ever since it was built in 1941, albeit at varying levels of activity. During its peak years nearly 12,000 military personnel and dependants lived in the Goose Bay area. Since 1980 there has been a noticeable increase in military flying activity, specifically low level flying. With the initial interest shown at that time by the German

Air Force in commencing flying operations at Goose Bay, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low flying activity and also was to include consideration for requirements for practice target ranges.

This evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data relating to such activities. It was not intended to be an in-depth on-site study by specialists. The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible but, as existing data on caribou were inconclusive, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance be established. In order to co-ordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Co-ordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises aircrew on a daily basis of local restrictions, such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps when these are known.

The northern training area has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas, as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on the aircrew maps with a five mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low flying aircraft.

Currently, there are four military

users at Goose Bay, all of which are signators to a 10-year multinational Memorandum of Understanding signed in February of this year. This agreement covers all military flying activity at Goose Bay. The United States Air Force has a small detachment of personnel, whose primary role is to service transient aircraft on their way to and from Europe, primarily the large transport aircraft.

The Canadian Forces operate the long range radar at Lake Melville and the air traffic control radar facilities. As well, they provide transient servicing to Canadian Forces itinerant aircraft and, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters on a permanent basis.

The Royal Air Force conducts low level flying training using primarily Tornado aircraft.

The German Air Force conducts similar training using F-4 Phantoms, Alpha Jets and also Tornados.

As well as practicing low level navigation and tactical manoeuvering, these aircraft occasionally use the practice target range located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This range is an open, sandy area previously burnt out by a forest fire. It is approximately eight miles or 13 kilometres in diameter and is clearly marked with signs printed in four languages. Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range and some of these have a small smoke charge in them to indicate impact point.

There are no plans at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Another site is being examined in the northern training area, again with the idea of establishing a second practice target range, but to date no formal approval has been received for this area.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, the current users have indicated a desire to expand their operations somewhat over the next few years. As well, Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing a long term training program at Goose Bay. The Royal Netherlands Air Force hopes to conduct a half season training program in 1987 using 10 to 12 F-16 fighter aircraft and about 120 personnel.

The expanded program will continue to be oriented towards low level flying with some night and poor weather being done, as required. These last two activities are for training aircrew in the use of terrain-following radar equipment, which is currently installed in the Tornado aircraft.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, I would like to give a brief background to the NATO Training Centre project.

Must of the tactical flying training of the NATO air forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe, with a concentration over West Germany. Each year, for example, about 538,000 military sorties are flown over Germany day and night, a country with 63 million people in it, and abcut 110,000 of these are in the low level regime. Existing training areas in Europe are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities.

Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO aircrews.

Nations were asked at the time to submit their training requirements and, based on these statistics, a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum ideal facility to cater to all of the training requirements. As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed. The scope of the Training Centre was detailed in a Phase I Report, as it is called, submitted to NATO in June, 1983. Two countries have offered potential sites for the Centre: Goose Bay in Canada and Konya Air Base in Turkey. Site surveys were conducted of each site last year and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group to NATO.

NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site in December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design of the Centre.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December, 1988. During this phase, if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered either in the negotiations or with the planning and design, then the alternate site would be considered. The Training Centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year. In other words, for about 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties by transport aircraft every two weeks to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 aircrew and

1,300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multinational base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be in Goose Bay on a two or three-year posting, many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by upwards of 1,000 to 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operation centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer product stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities, such as a parallel runway, and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out at the Centre, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model for this Centre. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say, as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several types of training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance; air combat training at medium to high altitudes including supersonic flight; electronic warfare training using onboard and ground-based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery and they are looking ideally for four ranges similar to the type that exists to the south of Goose Bay; live weapons ranges, an optimum of three; tactical air support of Maritime operations or, in simpler terms, an anti-shipping role which would require a sea range; and, lastly, flag-type exercises involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles all flying at the same time. They are called flag exercises -- they refer to the two such exercises which are done in North America: One, is a Maple Flag exercise in Cold Lake, and the other in the United States, in Nevada, the Red Flag exercise.

Several of these requirements for the Centre, for the training facilities, are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes the sea range that I mentioned earlier, which is merely an area for aircraft to conduct tactics and manoeuvers against naval shipping and also, from time to time, to be able to shoot at targets towed by ships. Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it was established at all.

Since the initial statement of requirement in 1981 for live weapons ranges, technology has advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets on the ground without any ordinance coming off the aircraft. This no-drop bomb scoring system, as it is called, has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site.

These ranges, incidentally, as we have them in other parts of Canada, are very closely monitored and regular clean-up programs are done on them.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full scope optimum facility was examined, as was defined in the Phase I Report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative as any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular operational phase. During its site survey last year the NATO working group examined the towns of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville as possible alternative airfield locations. These alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergencies or weather diversion or could also be used as a forward operating location to launch a small number of aircraft to act in an adversary role.

Such utilization of these airfields would require some upgrading of existing facilities such as runway extension, refuelling system upgrade and possibly some accommodations construction or upgrade. The working group is focusing its attention for the location of the NATO Training Centre on the existing northern training areas, as depicted on the map behind me. This southern area, as it exists today, would still be used primarily for low level flying training.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that expansion proposals which have been discussed and studied to date are based on the assumption that a full scope Training Centre would be constructed. However, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military programs, such as I have described, are not exempt.

As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I am willing to take any questions at this time pertaining to my presentation and the two proposals which have been discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

If anyone does have a question, I would ask you to use the microphone standing in the middle of the room and to give your name clearly for the record before you start to speak.

Would anyone like to ask a question about the project?

Yes, please, would you come forward?

DR. MAUREEN BAIKIE: My name is Maureen Baikie. This is the first time that I have heard any mention made in terms of supplies, of extension of the current shipping season. Does this mean that the consideration would be given to icebreaker activity in Lake Melville?

MAJOR McCABE: That is the kind of extension that I am talking about. I think, as you probably know, studies have been done in the past on the feasibility of extending the shipping season with icebreakers. It is merely one of the possibilities, if you like, that is being considered because the scop of activity that is proposed for this Centre or with the expansion of current activity would necessitate a regular fairly reliable supply system. Unfortunately, a lot of it is heavy and would have to come by road or by sea.

DR. M. BAIKIE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else like to ask a question? Yes?

MRS. KATHERINE BAIKIE-POTTLE: Katherine Baikie-Pottle. I would like to ask in what area you said the second range would be. It is in the northern area; do you have an idea now where that might be?

MAJOR McCABE: The general area they are looking at is the northern training areas that exist. A site was proposed which, to my understanding, I think, has either been totolly rejected or has not been finally approved. I am not really completely up to date on the status of that. All I know is that it has not been approved for use at this time.

MRS. K. BAIKIE-POTTLE: Has there been some consideration for a storage weaponry area?

MAJOR McCABE: That kind of weapon storage would certainly be involved in the construction, if you like, of the establishment of the NATO Centre, particularly, where there would be a requirement for a considerable increase in weapons availability. Obvious locations would be the existing weapons storage facility which is currently, really, inactive on the south side of the airfield.

MRS. K. BAIKIE-POTTLE: You spoke about the need for military recreational facilities and such. Will civilians receive -- say, if you take the bowling alley or any of those facilties that are in existence now for military, will there be something built for civilians to offset that loss?

MAJOR McCABE: I would suggest that -- again, this is strictly my opinion -- I do think you would see a case of existing facilities being taken from the civilians. I think you would possibly see either an expansion of current facilities which would continue to be open to everyone or the construction of new facilities. I have not heard any suggestion that there would be a monopolizing, if you like, of existing facilities.

MRS. K. BAIKIE-POTTLE: One last question, Mr. Chairperson. There has been rumours that the base will be closed off for civilian people later on down the road if the NATO base does come here. Do you think that will happen?

MAJOR McCABE: It depends on your definition of base. I think the only kind of restriction, if you like, is the sort of thing which currently exists and that is flight line activity. To my knowledge, the kind of facilities that would be constructed, particularly for the NATO Centre, can be done in such an area that it would not really increase any kind of restriction that currently exists.

MRS. K. BAIKIE-POTTLE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Major McCabe?

MR. ALBERT MICHELIN: Albert Michelin.

Regarding low level flying, do you anticipate any sea targets in the near future being located off our coast of Labrador and in what areas might you look at these target areas as being?

MAJOR McCABE: Let me just elaborate a little bit on that. First of all, with regard to the low flying activity that we currently see in Goose Bay and in the interior, there is no requirement that has been stated for the establishment of any kind of sea ranges for that operation. Therefore, with the expansion of that operation, I do not see that coming up, at least I have not heard of any.

The NATO Centre is a different matter. I mentioned in my presentation that the requirement for a sea range or an area to conduct that type of activity, first of all, is an optional item. If, for example, during the detailed planning and design of this Centre, they were to examine all the areas off the coast and find that it was non-suitable, then they would have to turn around and say, sorry, we cannot establish such a Centre -- such a range.

MR. MICHELIN: Say that they find it is suitable. Would it be near any communities that exist along the coast and, if it is, will the local community benefit in any ways, for instance in employment?

MAJOR McCABE: I really could not sort of project any employment opportunities. These ranges -- when we talk about a sea range, it is not something that is established permanently in the water. It is an area of defined dimensions where this kind of activity can take place. Now, should there be some kind of over-water activity established, be it an air-to-air range or the sea range, there would be a requirement, for example, for rescue launches, rescue vessels. So, that might have some kind of effect on the coastal area.

MR. MICHELIN: So, for instance, would it include anything like islands or anything like that? Would that possibly be taken into account?

MAJOR McCABE: I am sorry, include what?

MR. MICHELIN: If you are going to be having a sea range and there is going to be tactical weapons and everything else going on in there, shooting or whatever -- you know, shooting in the sense of with their electronic devices -- once that is rolling along, possibly in the future after that, these live bombs may be brought in whether they are just for detection or whatever. Can it possibly include islands, for instance, as a site other than just air tactics?

MAJOR McCABE: I really do not know -- I mentioned that such ranges do exist off the coasts of North America and, in fact, some of the European islands. Countries do have such ranges that include -- I know one that I have used in Norway, for example, which has an island, if you want to call it that. It is a small lump of rock off the coast that people shoot at.

I might mention that, to my knowledge, normally live weapons are not used in these kinds of ranges because there is no purpose to that. When they talk about the establishment of an anti-shipping range or something like that, normally it does not include such a thing as an island because you want something that is literally against shipping. So, again, I do not rule that out but it would be sort of an add-on thing.

MR. MICHELIN: Maybe this question should be directed at the Panel. I was just wondering, are there any studies in the area of environmental effect on marine life, that low level flying might have on marine life, whether it be seals, migratory birds, anything in nature?

THE CHAIRMAN: To our knowledge, there are not any studies going on at the present time but there is a section in the Guidelines which will direct National Defence to consider that issue and, if any new studies are needed to produce information, then I presume those would be done. Once we give the instructions to National Defence, it is up to them to decide how to collect and present the information in the Impact Statement.

MR. MICHELIN: I myself see that as pretty important. I think the studies should be done in that area and the people should be consulted with respect to the findings.

THE CHAIRMAN: I agree.

MR. MICHELIN: I would like to get back you again and that is for the proposed NATO base for Goose Bay. Do you see a lot of employment in the creation of the NATO base; can you give me any kind of numbers on that, job-wise, for the civilian population in this Lake Melville area?

MAJOR McCABE: I mentioned in my presentation that the Department of National Defence is really putting the finishing touches to a study which would give some indication of potential job opportunities, types of jobs, et cetera. As that study has not been released, I really cannot give out any figures. The big thing I want to emphasize there and I think will be stated when that study is made public, it is based on -- first of all, they use an established model, if you like, a computer model to come up with these figures. People have to understand that what they looked at was the description with reference to the NATO Centre, a description of the full size thing. It is very important to understand that.

If they decided to establish a smaller version of that NATO Centre, then the figures that would be in this report that will be released would have to be downsized as well, if you like.

MR. MICHELIN: One comment I would like to pass on before I leave and that is, a lot of people in this area are a bit afraid in the sense that the NATO base may bring in and create jobs, as you say, but they are only going to be short term jobs, a few years. The long term jobs just might not be there and is it really worth it? People are looking for long term security and prospective employment. Just pick and axe kind of job opportunities are not exactly what we are looking for. We are also wondering what kind of training can be given to us as groups that belong here so that we can get involved with these types of things.

MAJOR McCABE: That concern has been brought up in previous hearings. For example, Mr. Quinlan in Happy Valley-Goose Bay has expressed a concern of getting early notice or indication of the types of jobs that would be required so they can set up suitable training courses in the community college. That is the sort of thing that will be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement and it ties back to what I mentioned about the two phases there.

The construction phase, as with any kind of construction, obviously has certain types of jobs. Once construction is completed, some of those jobs will be terminated. When you get an on-going operational phase or the day-to-day routine, the support, et cetera, there you would have long term jobs, numbers, et cetera. Again, it really depends.

MR. MICHELIN: Thank you.

Tape 5A

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, do you have a question, sir?

MR. DAVID PADDON: I also have a question about a possible sea range if the full blown NATO base goes ahead. What sort of a, I guess the word is, mission profile would you use in maritime operations? Are you looking at, say, leaving Goose Bay and climbing to a high altitude before you get out off the coast or is it going to be low level all the way out?

MAJOR McCABE: Specific details of that really are hard to put forth at this time. The obvious thing there is consideration of the fact that it is 120-odd miles out to the coast in a direct line at the closest point. Fuel consumption of jet aircraft is such that going out at high level you obviously save fuel. Now, if they ended up having a low level profile, then you would have to take into consideration an access corridor, if you like, a route to and from because, as you are probably aware, low level activity is restricted along the coastal areas right now for a variety of reasons.

So, that kind of thing would have to be taken into consideration.

MR. PADDON: I was just wondering if some of the coastal communities would be subject to the loud noise but there would be some kind of a corridor, you are saying?

MAJOR McCABE: Oh, definitely. There is no way -- that is one of our prime concerns, of course, is avoiding established communities in any kind of activity that we do. There are plenty of areas off the coast where a person could establish an en route corridor, if you like, which are far from any communities and that would have to be taken into consideration.

MR. PADDON: The other thing is -- perhaps I can ask you a question first. How many sorties a day do we have in the busy season now, roughly?

MAJOR McCABE: I think probably -- Colonel David may be able to back me up on this -- on a very good day in the middle of summer we probably get upwards of 70, 80 or more.

MR. PADDON: You mentioned a figure of, I think it was, 200 if there was a full blown NATO establishment here. Would that be in addition or would 200 be the total or would there be 270, 280?

MAJOR McCABE: That would be in addition.

MR. PADDON: Okay, so we are approaching something like 300 sorties a day. Given that sort of volume, are those two areas big enough to handle that much traffic or will they be expanded at some point in the future?

MAJOR McCABE: When you get into this

kind of sortie rate, as we have, in fact, that rate at other places in North America, you obviously get into a control and co-ordination situation by necessity and it is really scheduling. We feel that the existing areas, possibly with some extension or expansion in various corners or whatever, are certainly adequate to handle that.

MR. PADDON: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

If not, then thank you very much, Major McCabe.

At this point I would like to introduce to you three people on whom the Panel depends very heavily. I referred to the Members of the Secretariat to the Panel who work very hard at compiling and presenting information collected from various quarters to the Panel, answering inquiries from the public, arranging meetings like this, arranged for our transportation and a host of other duties. The Executive Secretary to the Panel, first of all, is Mr. Carol Martin. I would like him to -- oh, he is standing there at the back of the room. He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon and Mr. Jim Clarke.

I am identifying these people because they are here to assist you, too. If you would like to have information on the assessment process or on this review or if you would like to have your name placed on the mailing list for this review, if you like to order a copy of the official transcript of this meeting or any other meeting that we are having, anything of that nature, please go to one of these three gentlemen and identify yourself, provide your name and address.

I am about to call a break in the meeting. During that break I would suggest that you come to the front or the side and look at the maps we have on the wall. Feel free to speak to Major McCabe, if you think of any other questions you would like to ask him. You are also welcome to speak to any of us on the Panel. If you have not already indicated your wish to speak tonight but you feel you would like to say something to the Panel, please give your name to Mr. Clarke and we will add your name to the list of those who have already indicated that they wish to speak.

So, after the break we will reconvene in approximately 15 minutes and begin with our speakers. Thank you very much.

---Short Recess at 8:45 p.m.

---Upon Resuming at 9:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, there are four persons who have indicated to us that they would like to speak. We will invite these to come forward in the order in which they identified themselves to us originally.

First, we are to hear from the North West River Health Committee. Dr. Maureen Baikie, please?

---SUBMISSION BY DR. MAUREEN BAIKIE:

Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen. Once more, my name for the record is Maureen Baikie, I am Chairperson of the North West River Health Committee. On behalf of the Health Committee I would like to make a very short presentation to the Panel solely on the health perspectives of this project. But, first, let me give you some background information about our group.

The North West River Health Committee was formed in September 1982. Our main goals are to promote a healthy lifestyle and to ensure that ordinary people are aware of and involved in all health issues. Until three years ago, North West River was the centre of health care for northern Labrador. Then, our hospital was closed. At that time, this Committee was very vocal in its concerns about the adequacy of the Melville Hospital to deal with the extra patient load.

Since then we have heard varying rumours about what would happen to the hospital if military activity escalated. The project description sheds no light on this matter. It merely states that local and provincial health education and social infrastructure and services would be used where possible.

In the Draft Guidelines, in the section on minimum information required in the Environmental Impact Statement, the proponent is required to outline

Baikie, Sub:

the provision of recreational and community services to base personnel. We assume this includes health facilities and we think DND should be directed to outline in detail such things as the fate of the current Melville Hospital facility; the projected pattern of hospital use by the military, for instance will DND use hospital beds in the public facility, will seriously ill military personnel be evacuated to larger centres or their home countries, as the case may be and as often happens now; and what will the need for specialists be, et cetera?

I did not ask the questions when the gentleman from DND was up earlier, I did not want to steal my own thunder. Perhaps he will have a chance to address those a bit later.

Recreational facilities should be treated similarly. North West River residents have minimal recreational facilities here, so we are very dependent on Happy Valley-Goose Bay for these needs, which are so closely related to our health.

We noticed that the minimum information required for the low level flying component, as noted in the Draft Guidelines, does not include information on the use of public facilities. Yet, if more bilateral agreements are signed and more personnel arrive every year, as seems to be the pattern, then the questions of adequacy of existing facilities still needs to be answered. We urge the Panel to seek this

Baikie, Sub:

information for both components of the assessment.

We understand that any project of this size, which represents the possibilities of rapid development and socio-economic change, will impact on our health in many subtle and not too subtle ways. We do not understand all the interrelationships involved. We are not sure that things like stress and cultural change are easily and reliably measured. We do know that there is a large body of literature on the impact of development on rural communities and health problems related to noise levels around airports. We urge the Panel to put more emphasis in the Guidelines on these kinds of health-related issues.

This leads into the Health Committee's other major concern, monitoring programs. Other areas that have experienced fairly rapid development seem to have had subsequent problems with things like alcohol and drug abuse, unwanted pregnancy, social diseases like V.D. Plans to closely monitor the health status of the affected population must be included, as well as preventive and education strategies designed to minimize the adverse impact in this area.

One of the most stressful aspects of the possibilities of increased military activity is the lack of accurate, verifiable information about the project given to ordinary people in an unbiased way. Rumour abounds. Quite frankly, it is our opinion that DND has done a terrible job of keeping the public

Baikie, Sub:

informed in a responsible manner. The project description is a good example. This is the project description that is written information coming from the FEARO office. It is full of jargon, it is basically unreadable, and it is incomprehensible to the general public.

Moreover, it is incomplete with large areas left to be defined. This itself opens the way to speculation. Such community-wide uncertainty does not help our social and mental well-being.

Health Committee Members also found the Draft Guidelines difficult to follow. However, hopefully, the detail directed by the Guidelines will answer some of the outstanding questions so we know what we will be dealing with in the future.

That is the end of the prepared remarks I have but I would just like to take this opportunity to make a few ad lib comments. I was struck by the proponent's lack of specifics in the talk on the project description. Somehow the question of supplies and the possibility of icebreaking just snuck in. I have never heard that mentioned before. I am not an environmentalist but I would imagine that there would be considerable environmental impacts of icebreaking and this would be a particular concern to North West River and, of course, to other communities like Rigolet. I assure you, I will be dusting off the studies that were done on this when icebreaking was

Baikie, Sub:

done before.

Perhaps at some point the gentleman from DND could answer some of the questions about the hospital facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, would you care to respond to that, please?

MAJOR McCABE: I would like to also respond to a couple of other things you mentioned. Things like hospital facilities, et cetera, first of all, are not a DND responsibility. I am sure you are aware of that. This all ties in -- any kind of expansion all ties in with the necessity for co-ordinated development programs at all levels of government, local, provincial and federal. We are in the process of organizing such a committee for information purposes between the three levels.

That kind of development certainly has to be taken into consideration. It does fall under the Guidelines, I think, for the requirement for facilities based on projected increases of personnel, et cetera. I cannot give any specifics of what will happen with that because they do not exist.

That takes me into a larger area of concern of mine which is where you made reference to DND's terrible handling of information on this NATO project. I tried to bring it out and emphasize it in my presentation and I will emphasize it again. People have to understand that we have a proposal that exists on paper, an ideal thing, a plan that was drawn up with no particular country or location in mind when it was done. They have taken that proposal and they have gone to two locations and they have looked at the existing facilities and the required facilities based on that proposal. The site surveys that were done were over a three or four day period; the reports that were produced as a result of those surveys are, in our opinion, lacking in many respects.

I have to come back to this fourth phase which takes place over the next two years. It is only at that point that we get into detailed planning and design. It is not DND's intent to be evasive and everything else. People really have to understand that there are no specific details of what the NATO facility would look like in Goose Bay because we have not got the thing yet.

Once the site is selected and people sit down and start negotiating and planning, then teams of specialists will come in and spend a considerable amount of time at Goose Bay, for example, and they will, with co-ordination with the various local officials and the different levels once again, plan this thing. We just do not have the detail that people are so desperately looking for. It has not been done and that is not through lack of co-ordination or planning, it is just too early in the process. We are trying to do this thing now, as early as possible, to ensure that it is done in a proper time.

There has been, for example, and I will mention it, the recommendation that I mentioned that has been made to NATO, which is going up to the review process, at present favours the Turkish location. The question came up because it is mentioned in the terms of reference: should the decision in December, for example, go to the Turkish location, should the FEARO process stop with relation to the NATO project? My response to that is, definitely not, because if, a year from now, they turn around and say, we are going to do it in Goose Bay or if we do it in Goose Bay in the first place, we have to ensure that all of this work is done beforehand, so we can say, fine, we are ready to go. We cannot turn around -- cancel it now and turn around a year from now and start all over again.

But I share your concern about the lack of detail of specifics of what building is going to go where, where various ranges, et cetera, are going to go. We just do not know. That kind of detailed planning has not been done yet. So, we are not doing this deliberately to keep the public in the dark.

DR. BAIKIE: Am I free to ask some questions -- to dialogue with the gentleman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly, go right ahead.

DR. BAIKIE: I am not sure if this should be directed at you but something seems to be basically wrong or I am basically very confused. Here we are trying to have an assessment process where we are studying the impacts on the environment in its broadest sense, socio-economic aspects, health aspects and everything else of a project, yet we do not know what the project is going to be. I mean, how can we do that?

MAJOR McCABE: This is why we have a project which is a very large thing. We have some ideas of the levels of activity, the number of people that would be involved. All of these represent -- if you can understand when I say this -- a worst case situation, the maximum level of activity. It is that level that we are examining. Should we have the possibility of putting such a centre in full-scope, then we want to make sure that this study covers that full scope. I suggest that it is not going to be able to be that big but, in the meantime, we will have covered the extreme.

DR. BAIKIE: Yet, you do not have the details of that extreme scope. I will not belabour --

MAJOR McCABE: No, we do have -- for example, the sortie rates, et cetera, that I mentioned, those are the ideal, the big picture. It may well happen that the 200 sorties I gave an example of might only be 100 because there are half the number of airplanes here. Do you see what I mean?

DR. BAIKIE: Do you have the details, then, for instance, of the pattern of hospital use based on the experience now or is it something to be determined in the EIS?

MAJOR McCABE: That would determined in the planning phase. Yes, in the EIS. It is not something that -- when the team was here, for example, they looked at existing facilities. You can obviously project from that that there would be more facilities required.

DR. BAIKIE: Is it the pattern in projects such as these to use a military hospital or will hospitals be included in use of public facilities?

MAJOR McCABE: I am really not sure what they would end up doing. I know in the past, for example, we had a military hospital there, the existing hospital was military only. I am really not sure what would happen there. I would suggest that, in building or expanding facilities, they would probably or possibly end up having a facility constructed in the civilian community, if you like. I really do not know. There is no -- once again, no specifics have been put down on that.

DR. BAIKIE: I guess that is the kind of detail we are interested in knowing because, obviously, that is only facility we have. We suffered the loss of one facility already and we are quite concerned about our own on-going care.

MAJOR McCABE: We all have those same concerns and any nation that comes in here wants to ensure that its personnel are going to be adequately cared for. All of that kind of planning will certainly take place before everybody moves in.

DR. BAIKIE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I could add something here. I think it is important to understand that environmental impact assessment is intended to be a part of the planning process for a project. It is not at all unusual to put a proposal through the Environmental Assessment Process at a stage of conceptual design. Part of the intention being that the outcome of the assessment helps you design the detail of the project. So, I think that is very much the situation that we see here in this case, that we are looking at a concept and we will have a fair amount of detail in some areas but in other areas it may be fairly general design. We have to accept that situation and deal with it as best we can.

DR. BAIKIE: Yes, thank you, that clarifies it, then. I guess the real point to be made is so long as all those issues are considered in some way, whether the detail is available or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any other questions or anything further to say?

DR. BAIKIE: No, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone on the Panel care to ask a question of Dr. Baikie?

Thank you very much.

Our next scheduled speaker is Mrs. Loder, who is going to speak on behalf of the senior citizens of North West River.

---SUBMISSION BY MRS. MILLICENT LODER:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Panel and ladies and gentlemen, my name is Millicent Loder. I am a native-born Labradorian and have spent the greater part of my years in Labrador. I speak not only for myself but for my peers, at least some of them.

We lived here before radio, electricity, airplanes, had only one store in the community, The Hudson's Bay Company, travelled by dogteam and rowboat and on foot and lived mainly off the land. We had a healthy respect for the harshness of our land and a love for the peace and quiet and serenity that it afforded us. We lived in peace and harmony, settlers, Innu and Inuit.

Progress came slowly. We welcomed churches, schools, nursing stations, hospitals, electricity, air travel and the partial development of some of our natural resources. With progress came some undesirable changes as well. Our social life deteriorated somewhat, there is more crime, alcohol and drug abuse and suicides. There are more disruptions in the once close-knit family units. Our Native peoples, the Innu and Inuit, are fighting desperately for the survival of their way of life and their lands.

We have had a military presence in Labrador since the 1940's. I guess that during the construction stages in Goose Bay and other areas, people were helped money-wise but there is always som

Loder, Sub:

negative aspects to a development. You need only to take a trip along the coast to see the scabs that scar the beauty of the land, where remnants of old military buildings are seen high on the top of some beautiful hills, or go berry picking and trip over old batteries, concrete blocks and wires that are now partially hidden by undergrowth. It is when you are hunting, fishing or berry picking in some quiet place that the low flying planes scream down at you and your ears do hurt and the animals do run for shelter, no matter what the statistics show.

Yet, I see Labrador as one of the few remaining countries that is free and still a little primitive, with untold beauty to enjoy, clear skies, clean, fresh air to breathe, and a haven for those wishing to escape for a while the noise, pollution and frantic pace of the cities.

Now there is talk of having a NATO base here. I am not against progress but would rather see it come by a wise and carefully controlled planning of the development of our natural resources of which there are many. Should NATO come or even more stepped up military presence here, I would like some answers to some questions and some of these questions have already been asked. I would like to know what the approximate number of people are who will come into Goose Bay? Two, can you tell us the prospective number and type of jobs that will be available to the

Loder, Sub:

Native people? Native, in this sense, means the Innu, Inuit and settler peoples.

Will there be training available for these jobs or will our people be told, as usual, that I am sorry, we cannot take you, you have not got the skills? Now is the time to be training them for any prospective jobs.

Three, will the peoples of Labrador have knowledge about the construction process? In other words, will there be a blueprint that people can see and discuss before construction takes place and final decisions are made? I am thinking now of the hunters and the trappers' grounds and of the Innu and Inuit land grant claims.

Number four, will there be control over the sports fishing, hunting and trapping rights of the people? I am thinking of the military people; will they be the same as the people here, will they have the same hunting rights? A lot of people here still depend a lot on the living they get from the land.

And, five, I understand that the decision as to where NATO will be is to be announced shortly. Somebody said in December. Perhaps the decision has already been made. I wonder, will there be time at this late date for the concerns that we are expressing tonight and will that make any difference?

I also want to know who is going to do the cleaning up at the end of all of this or is it

Loder, Sub:

going to be left like former installations have been left? You remember the PCB and the other problems we have had.

These are the concerns of at least some of the seniors in Labrador. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Loder.

Major McCabe, I wonder if you would care to respond to any of these questions at this time?

MAJOR McCABE: Mrs. Loder, as you mentioned, some of the questions have been answered already, so I will just touch on those.

Projected numbers of people coming in; again, we only have a very rough idea and we are looking at the biggest prospect. I know there have been a lot of concerns about that, that is one of the reasons I mentioned the population levels that used to be here in the peak years. We are not going to get up to that, probably not even close to it, as we foresee.

The numbers of jobs, et cetera; again, that is something that is being studied based on proposals, once again. There is, as I mentioned in my presentation, a great deal of potential danger, if you like, with speculation on that and that is why those figures have not been released prematurely. When they are, it will be very clearly stated that they are based on a model and things like that.

Tying in with that, there is a concern, and I am sure it will be addressed correctly, that sufficient time is given to the local and provincial academic institutions to prepare training programs with specific attention to the kind of job that would be available here. That is the intention.

The details of the construction, for example, particularly anything that goes into the interior, to say that everybody would have access to detailed information, blueprints, et cetera, I would suggest it would be more a case that in the planning of these facilities such as they may be, at that time people would be consulted, for example, to make sure that -- particularly the interior -- sites were acceptable to all concerned. So, in that sense, I think there would be an availability of knowledge there of details.

Access to hunting, et cetera, by the military. I am not sure if I understood exactly what you meant there. There is certainly not going to be any special privileges or anything like that. Once a person leaves his job on the base here and hangs his uniform up, he is just one of the citizens around here and is subject to the laws that might exist on hunting, et cetera.

I am sure, as there is right now, there is an interest particularly from foreign visitors that come into the area who take a great deal of pleasure in sharing the Canadian pride of their wilderness, et cetera. That happens now and I think that will be encouraged in the future. It will be encouraged in a correct sense. We will encourage them to use it properly, as we would like our own people to use it.

Is that the sort of thing that you ...

MRS. LODER: You hear people saying now that they have the fish all cleaned out of one place and the partridges are all gone in another place because the few Labradorians who like to live off the land, their lands are being cleaned up, you know, by outsiders. If you go around to the little communities, you hear this sort of thing.

MAJOR McCABE: I think that is something that, again, becomes the responsibility of other agencies other than Defence or as well as. Because, once again, when a person is finished his work and is going something on the outside, he is just another member of the public. I do not think there would be -- obviously, a large influx of people would have to take that into account, you know, access to these areas.

MRS. LODER: It would depend upon the hunting laws of the land they are in.

MAJOR McCABE: Very much so.

Timing of the NATO decision. I know this is a very, I do not know, confusing issue. It is one of my responsibilities, my desires in fact, during this series of public hearings to try and clarify a lot of misunderstanding that exists with the public. I tried to point out in my presentation the decision taken by NATO in December, should it occur then, is the completion of the third of four phases in the program. At that time there is no commitment undertaken by the nation concerned. Over the next two years all of that kind of thing will take place.

It would appear that it is sort of the-cart-before-the-horse thing, that is not the case. This Panel and the work they are doing, the Environmental Impact Statement, will have an effect on the outcome of that NATO project, for example, in the planning phase. If things are not ready, I would suggest that they are going to have to wait until they are ready. But it must be clearly understood that Canada, for example, in December is under no obligation to sign papers or anything else taking on full commitment and responsibility to have the Centre here.

Again, I have to come back to emphasize or underscore the Chairman's comments. It is the kind of information that will come out of this study that is probably more detailed than anything that has ever been done before with respect to this kind of activity. We need that information to do our planning, to do it in a proper sense.

Clean up at the end of the project, that is included in the Guidelines. Your comments on, for example, the old radar sites, there is a program on-going right now by National Defence to clean those sites up and to restore them as close as possible to their original state. So, that is something that we are trying to rectify.

MRS. LODER: Thank you.

I would like to suggest, if I may, to the Panel that for forums such as this the literature that you send out be done in a much more simplified manner. There are many people in the older generation at least, little chance to get any education and I must say that I find it hard to understand some of the phrases and the words myself. I think that it would be very reasonable to put out something in a much more simplified form for the people to understand.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation and thank you for your suggestion. Perhaps what we may have to consider is the preparation of a document that may be needed in the sort of form as these Draft Guidelines appear, because they have to contain a certain amount of technical content, but, in addition, an explanatory document to go along with it for the use of people in the community who need that. So, thank you for your suggestion.

Our third scheduled speaker is Ms Katherine Baikie-Pottle who will speak on behalf of the Town Council.

---SUBMISSION BY MS KATHERINE BAIKIE-POTTLE:

Tape 5B

Good evening, Mr. Chairperson, Panel Members and ladies and gentlemen. The Town Council of North West River, Labrador wishes to stress a few points that it feels should be addressed should there be an increase in military activity in the upper Lake

Baikie-Pottle, Sub:

Melville area.

Employment: Employment for civilian personnel must be one of the major factors. It is useful to encourage such activity unless the present population benefits from that development. Employment must be considered not only in the initial setting up, such as the construction stages, but also in the long term. The military must be encouraged and, yes, made to buy local, to use whatever resources and agencies are available so that the monies benefited from such a development stays within the area as much as possible.

There is already serious talk and action being taken to replace local employees with military employees. This should not be allowed to happen. In fact, more civilians should be hired to meet that demand. I refer specifically right now to the rumours of the firehalls being changed over and the -- can someone help me -- the weather station. I think that has already happened.

Education: Employment needs for such development will demand a close look at what our secondary schooling has to offer and where it can be revamped to meet those needs. With the proposed community college, we must stress the need for programs that will provide adequate certificates to meet the employment needs today and into the future.

Trapping grounds: Many of our people are still full time trappers and many more are part

Baikie-Pottle, Sub:

time trappers. We are very concerned about the preservation of their trap lines. It has been expressed to our Council that those trap lines will not be overflown by low level fighters. That is good news today. What about five, 10, 20 years down the road? Will there be some kind of guarantee written up that this protection will be continuous despite further escalation.

Before this Council will be totally satisfied that all measures are being met and all people protected, we must have assurances that our Native/settler trap lines remain as it is today. Inclusive in this study we wish to see a survey of trap lines completed. This would include the mapping of the area plus the pattern of harvest of the fur. That would be the quality and quantity.

Social problems: With many and all escalations of activity there is always the problems associated with it. This perhaps is the most difficult and the least protected area, the social one. We must take a serious look at the resources that we have available to us regarding health, such as alcohol and drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, et cetera. Our Council is very concerned about the condition and inadequacy of the present hospital, even for today's use. What happens with a sudden increase in the population?

Although there are some agencies working towards alcohol and drug awareness, there is certainly

Baikie-Pottle, Sub:

not enough being done and certainly not enough in place for a sudden increase in activity.

Just a comment and that is about the present hospital. I think its location is really, really in a very poor area. Even when you have low level flying now, it is quite noisy. It is not just the size of the building, it is not just the staffing, it is the location and I think this has to be seriously looked at.

The Council of North West River wishes to thank the Panel for their time and hope that their concerns will be incorporated into your Guidelines. We wish to express our concerns to you regarding your Guidelines and felt that they were extremely difficult to follow and must be even more so for lay people who, more often than not, have something very valuable to say. Hopefully, this problem will also be corrected.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Would anyone on the Panel care to ask a point of clarification? Was there anything, Major McCabe, that you felt you would like to respond to immediately?

MS BAIKIE-POTTLE: Can I just expand on this trap line? I am really concerned. I know, through talking to Colonel David and other military people, in fact yourself, right now there is a type of guarantee, a verbal guarantee that they will not fly over these areas. In 10, 20, 30 years from now will you have that same control? Who will have the control if it is a full-fledged NATO base? Right now you have a committee that says certain areas can be flown over. If there is escalation and 10 years down the road they decide they need to bring in more activity, who has control: will it be the trappers, will it be the military? I think this is something that has to be seriously looked at. We definitely do have full time trappers, that is their living. We have part time trappers who work seasonally and have to trap to bring in more income.

MAJOR McCABE: I, obviously, cannot make any kind of long term projections to the future of those kinds of guarantees. I share your concern that they are necessary. The reverse could possibly be true in the sense that 10 or 20 years down the road possibly the trappers might want to expand their trap lines into areas that do not exist right now. What kind of control is there over that kind of thing; I do not know. I would suggest that all of the planning, as is currently done with concern for that kind of thing, will be encouraged to continue that way.

I really do not know what kinds of guarantees can be made, other than our assurance that the livelihood of the local people will continue to be taken into any kind of planning like that.

MS BAIKIE-POTTLE: Can I just ask you

also, there has been a lot of talk and concern about the military being allowed to go into lakes fishing and not using the present entrepreneurs or outfitter people that are now in existence. If this continues to be a practice, then why are our people into business and why are we letting you come in?

MAJOR McCABE: I really cannot say much about that. I certainly cannot speak for current activities. Once again, I would assume that people will examine all of the facilities and operations that are available and we will, hopefully, choose accordingly. I do not think there is any -- to my knowledge, there is not any kind of plans to establish military-only huge fishing areas in the future or anything like that.

I want to say one thing about the concerns over the job situation and this perception of military taking over all the civilian things. We are only in the process of planning a transfer, if you like, of the current responsibilities from Transport Canada to DND. That is still on-going. The big drive behind the military expansion here from the government support, et cetera, I think is understood by everyone. It is an attempt to relieve some of the socio-economic problems here. Job creation or whatever is an intent.

There are some things which may end up being a military thing but it is not the intention of DND or any of the military forces to come in here and just arbitrarily put people out of jobs. I mean, that goes completely contrary to what the government's position is and we are part of the government.

One of the things that, of course, governs this kind of thing is existence of hiring freezes that might be in existence from time to time, government-directed, once again, through Treasury Board or whatever. We being a government dapartment, as are the others, are subject to that kind of thing and we do not have a lot of control over that. That, again, becomes a political thing that they have to do something with.

I would just like to reassure people that it is not some kind of an under-the-table plan on the part of DND to come and start moving people aside. That is not our intention. I do not know if that helps much; it probably does not.

MS BAIKIE-POTTLE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else from North West River who would like to say anything to the Panel?

If not, then I believe Colonel John David would like to speak on a couple of subjects. Would you care to come forward now, sir?

---SUBMISSION BY COLONEL JOHN DAVID:

Panel, ladies and gentlemen. My purpose is just to give more specific answers to some of the questions that were asked earlier because I do have some responsibility currently to ensure that these things are administered. I would like to take this

David, Sub:

opportunity to give you the latest up-to-date information that we have from a local point of view.

First, the concern of who would have control if there were a NATO or there were other operations here. Let there be no doubt, the Government of Canada will retain control and they will be making the decisions. They will be responsible for changing or defining the rules and regulations for which the operation takes place and it will be monitored closely. Slightly different than in the past when we had the United States Air Force base here where they were an integral unit and insular. That is different than what we are looking at in the future and with current operations.

Specific reference to the fishing and the current fishing camps and the use. It is strictly controlled by the provincial government. The provincial government regulates all fishing activities and fishing regulations and access. Our Department is bound by those and must meet and maintain the rules and regulations that they establish for us. It is closely monitored, I might add.

The north target area that you requested. As I mentioned, some two years ago there was an on-going requirement for two target areas for practice training area currently under the on-going bilateral agreements. The first one was selected in a southern area and that was not done by DND alone. In fact, from

David, Sub:

our point of view and how we operate currently, the crown lands are provincially legislated. We cannot do anything in any of these areas in Labrador without the consent, guidance and direction of the provincial government. So, in the selection of areas, the agreement of the Departments of Environment, Wildlife, Mines and Resources and all these other departments that are responsible for this legislation, make and determine and offer potential areas to meet the requirements for a practice target area.

In the case of the north, for over the past two years they have been making suggestions to us, we have been making other proposals, but, basically, the areas that they are looking at is a kill area, an area that has had a forest fire or a burnt out area. The Environment says we can see no impact in using this as a practice from an environmental point of view; the Wildlife people then say the same thing; the anthropologists and archeologists get their say; and, for example, we were close to finding an area north of the Lobstick area recently that all the different departments were looking at. Then Mines and Resources came in and said, there might be mineral wealth there that we want to develop immediately or short term and, therefore, there is another hold on that. So, this is not being done irresponsibly, it is being done in great detail and, when the provincial government has

David, Sub:

decided that these areas have potential use for a training area, then we make the final selection to meet our needs, based on specific requirements. So, we are still on-going in looking for a practice area in the northern flying zone.

The question on entry and access to coastal areas. Canada is responsible for the airspace management of all military activities in this area. If there were to be tactical air support of Maritime operations in the coastal areas as a result of the NATO Training Centre, for example, requiring a sea range access, the entry and access to the coastal areas would be monitored and managed in the Military Co-ordination Centre at Goose Bay. It would have to be very closely monitored for a number of reasons.

As you know, we have the new North Warning System going in and entry and access to the Canadian coastal identification zone of fast-moving targets must be closely monitored and must have prior approval for flight planning purposes. Therefore, the airspace management, whether it be low altitude or high altitude, would have to be totally deconflicted before you could have full scale or even part time training, either low level or in coastal areas. Does that answer the question better?

There is just no unlimited -- no one would ever be allowed unlimited access or whatever. That would have to be done and monitored.

We share your concerns about the

David, Sub:

hospitals, the schools -- that one did not come up -- the military have the same problems. In the current government policy -- and I do not see that changing -- is that for hospitals, for dependents of military or the employees that would be used at the airport, it is the provincial government's responsibility to ensure that there is adequate hospital facilities and Any increases that would be necessary would have to be negotiated and provided for by the provincial government. Obviously, there would be grants in lieu of taxes, there would be cost-sharing programs, but that is for the politicians and everybody else to decide.

In terms of schools, the same thing. Our policy is to use the provincial school system and foreign militaries will be offered the same opportunity. If they have special requirements because of language deficiencies, then they will have to fund that separately on their own requirements.

So, yes, we too have great concern about those same things that you have mentioned here, and I can assure that, when we have more specific data ourselves, this will be aggressively pursued. Does that help you a little bit in your answer? It is very difficult to get specifics but, in fact, it will. What it will mean is that, if the current facility does not meet the demands of the people of the coast of Labrador -- because that is now the coastal

David, Sub:

hospital as well -- in this area, then the pressure will be on the provincial government to find the most acceptable new facility. I am certain that many of the people in this room will have a very large voice in saying that specifically. I think the concern of being off the base for a civilian hospital is very, very clear to all of the people that I have spoken to, and I believe that that will be pursued to some extent.

The icebreaker question that you brought up: Currently, the only envisioned large scale activity would be to extend the shipping season somewhat for fuel requirements because most of the other dry goods and other logistic support that we get now could be done primarily in the normal shipping season, especially if you are talking about construction materials or that sort of thing. You can only construct primarily here in the summer, anyway, and that sort of thing. So, those concerns will be addressed but I do not see a great problem with that, as you may have indicated.

The other thing that I would like to mention is the peoples' concern about the environment. The environmental laws of this country have come a long way since the first coastal radars were put in. Our department and all departments are bound by those new laws and I doubt that we will see in the future the environmental derelicts that we have

David, Sub:

in the past. What it is going to mean is that it is going to be more difficult for you and I, if we want to even build an outhouse, because we are going to have to stick to those very stringent regulations, too. But, I think for those people and for everybody, it is to our advantage and I assure you that we are not exempt from those new rigid laws.

With respect to the current turmoil of the transfer of jobs of Transport Canada to DND, the one that keeps cropping up in addition is the firehall. The current situation on the firehall is this: Transport Canada had a 19 person firehall last year. We have taken on the 13 people that Public Works were laying off, local civilian people, to increase that and it is the intent for the firehall, by 1988 at the latest, to be up to a 51 person unit. The maximum current military involvement in that, under any of the options that are available, is six military people involved in the firehall. So, you are looking at a net increase in civilian jobs. It is our hope, from the base point of view and the military, that all of the new positions will come from the local area, although I must caution you that we, too, like everybody else, are bound by the Public Service Commission, the unions, and there are certain constraints there that we do not have control over. But it is the intent to encourage that.

The other areas are going to be closely

David, Sub:

scrutinized and it is our hope that we will be able to maintain or increase the civilian jobs in the community as a result of this because, from a DND point of view, it is much to our advantage to have maximum local civilian participation. We do not have to move people in and out, we save on those costs, but we have the loyalty of those people because we know that they want to stay here because they are here by their own choice. We do not have to worry about them necessarily quitting tomorrow because they do not like living in Labrador and going off to Halifax.

So, you can see that our aims are the same as yours, we intend to pursue them and I hope that I have been able to answer some of the current questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colonel David.

I am now offering one final opportunity for anyone else to come forward and speak.

Very well, then I believe it is time to bring the meeting to a close. In doing so, I would like to thank the Members of our Secretariat. I would like to thank all of you from North West River and elsewhere for coming to the meeting tonight. It is very nice to see a good turnout like this. Thank you especially to those of you who have come forward and spoken to us, thank you for your presentations, your information and please be assured that we will consider it all very carefully next month when we sit down to refine the Guidelines into their final form.

A word of thanks also to Mrs. Thomson, our Court Reporter seated at the side table, close to the back door; thanks also to Mr. Sicoli, our audio technician at the back of the room; and thank you to the persons who have provided us with interpretation services.

Thanks very much and goodnight.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Volume

10

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	FORT CHIMO	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 16, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	10	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Kuujjuaq Recreational Hall, Fort Chimo

DATE: October/octobre 16, 1986.

VOLUME: 10

I N D E X

PAGE

MORNING SESSION

Presentation by Major David McCabe 873

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

George Koneak 885
Jacky Koneak 888
Pierre Marchand 892
Stas Olpinski 895
Dr. Jacques Giguere 900
Willie Gordon 901
Johnny Peters 905
Camille Mageau 908

* * * * *

AFTERNOON SESSION

Presentation by The Chairman 912

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Jacques Giguere 926
Jacky Koneak 927
Pierre Marchand 929
Jimmy Johannes 930
Stas Olpinski 931
Pierre Marchand 932
Joseph Agma 934

I N D E X (CONT'D)

PAGE

AFTERNOON SESSION (CONT'D)

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Johnny Peters 935
Stas Olpinksi 937
Johnny Peters 940
Daisy Watt 954
Tikile Kleist 957
Jocelyn Barrett, Louisa Whiteley and Michael Gordon 967

* * * * *

EVENING SESSION

Introduction by The Chairman 969
Presentation by Major David McCabe 971
Presentation by The Chairman 980

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Pierre Marchand, Tommy Grey and Dr. Jacques Giguere 985
Major David McCabe 1003
George Koneak 1010
Jacques Giguere 1012
Stas Olpinski 1013
Camille Mageau 1014
Johnny Peters 1016
Stas Olpinski 1017
Pierre Marchand 1019
David Ookpik 1021
Sandy Saunders 1022

INDEX (CONT'D)

PAGE

EVENING SESSION (CONT'D)

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Michael Barrett 1024
Willie Makuik 1027
Camille Mageau 1030

* * * * *

---Upon Commencing at 10:25 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Welcome to our meeting.

My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct an environmental review of certain on-going and proposed military flying activities over parts of Labrador and Quebec. We are very happy to be here in Kuujjuaq. The weather is a little cooler than what we have been accustomed to in recent days, but that is fine.

We have come here to talk to you about this military flying project and to listen to what you people would like to say to us. Before proceeding with the meeting, I would like to turn the floor over to Mr. George Koneak, who, I understand, would like to say something.

Mr. Koneak?

MR. GEORGE KONEAK: First of all, I want to say that I want to use my own tongue.

Je vais parler dans ma langue maternelle, malheureusement notre maire Kuujjuaq n'a pas pu être présent à cette reunion, il avait d'autres responsabilités, il était pris ailleurs et puisque je travaille avec lui, je le represente à cette reunion et j'aimerais souhaiter la bienvenue à tout le monde. Je crois que toutes les personnes ici aujourd'hui sont préoccupées par l'impact que ces survols peuvent avoir sur l'environnement. Je crois que nous devons travailler ensemble pour...

Since we live off the land here, since we are very concerned about the animals that live off the land, since we do not have an agriculture up here and since we do not have any domestic animals to live off of, we live off the animals, off the land and off the birds, the migratory birds as well. I am looking forward to working out -- this is the message I got from the Mayor from Kuujjuaq, and I myself will have something else to say as well after lunch and after you present your presentations. I will listen to that first and then present my views in the afternoon.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Koneak.

Now I would like to introduce to you the other members of our Panel. Beginning at the end of the table to your left, Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position before his retirement was as Deputy Commander of one of the regions of NORAD, which included responsibilities for the training and equipping, maintaining and deployment of United States and Canadian Air Defence Forces in NORAD. Mr. Stewart lives in the Ottawa area and operates his own farm.

Next to him at my right is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has had extensive experience with wildlife in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. He lives in St. John's where he is the Vice-President of a company called Northland Associates Limited, which is a consulting firm in environmental and resource matters.

At my left is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik, Labrador where he operates a small business. He is very knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in certain commercial enterprises in Sept-Iles. Before his retirement he was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec and he was nominated to be a member of this Panel by the Kativik Regional Government. Dr. Wilkinson lives in Montreal where he operates a consulting firm. He has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

I am employed at the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, an agency of the Government of Canada in Ottawa, where I am Director for the Atlantic Region. Prior to that I was employed with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the

Department of Environment.

Now, as I said earlier, this Panel is here in Kuujjuaq to talk to you about this project and about its environmental effects and to listen to whatever you wish to say to us. I think it is very important for us all to understand exactly what this project is all about. For that purpose, we have invited to this meeting a representative of the Department of National Defence. That person is seated at the front of the audience. He is Major David McCabe. I would ask him to stand and identify himself.

Major McCabe, if you are ready, I think perhaps this would be a good time for you to make a presentation.

After Major McCabe has described this project that we are reviewing, he will be very pleased to answer any questions that you may have about the project.

Major McCabe?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen of Kuujjuaq.

By way of introduction, very briefly, I am from Ottawa, from National Defence Headquarters. I am the project officer, or the officer of primary responsibility, for the military developments at Goose Bay, including the two military proposals which I will describe to you and which are being examined by this study.

Goose Bay Airport was built in 1941 during the Second World War primarily as a military base. Ever since that time, Goose Bay has always had a military presence, albeit at different levels of activity. At its peak period, with the United States Air Force present, there were about 12,000 military personnel and dependents living at Goose Bay Airport.

Since 1980, there has been a noticeable increase in military flying activity at Goose Bay, specifically what we call low level flying. At that time, there was an initial interest shown by the German Air Force in commencing flying operations at Goose Bay. The Department of National Defence was obligated to conduct what is called an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low flying activity, which also included consideration for the requirement for the establishment of a practice target range.

This evaluation was limited to a desk study of existing data on such activities. It was not intended to be an in-depth on-site study by specialists, it was done by a military officer in Ottawa. The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would be negligible but, as existing data on caribou and high performance aircraft or jet aircraft were inconclusive, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance of the caribou be established, avoidance whenever possible.

In order to co-ordinate and control all of the local military flying that was occurring at the time in a safe and efficient manner, a military co-ordination centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and it advises the aircrew on a daily basis of local restrictions such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps when these are known. That is camps that are within the established low level flying areas.

The northern training area, and these areas I am referring to are depicted on a map behind me, the northern training area has been subdivided in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on maps that the aircrew use for their flying with a five mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low flying aircraft.

Currently, there are four military users at Goose Bay, all of which are signators to a 10 year multinational Memorandum of Understanding which was signed in February of this year. This agreement covers all military flying activity at Goose Bay. The United States Air Force has a small detachment of personnel whose primary role is to service transient transport aircraft on their way to and from Europe.

The Canadian Forces operate the long

range radar and air traffic control radar facilities, provide transient servicing to Canadian itinerant aircraft and, as of March of this year, operate three rescue helicopters on a permanent basis. In the past, the Canadian rescue helicopters were only in Goose Bay during the summer. As of March, we have three aircraft there year round.

The Royal Air Force from the United Kingdom conducts low level flying training using primarily the new Tornado fighter bomber aircraft.

The German Air Force conducts similar training using F-4 Phantoms, Alpha Jets and also Tornados.

As well as practicing low level navigation and tactical manoeuvering, these aircraft occasionally use the practice target range that I mentioned earlier, which is located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This range is in an open sandy area which has been previously burned over during a forest fire. It is approximately eight miles or 13 kilometers in diameter and is clearly marked with signs printed in four languages. Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range. Some of these devices have a small smoke charge in them to better indicate impact point. There are no plans at this time to use this range for any kind of live weapons.

Another site is being examined in the northern training area to establish a second practice range, very similar to the one that exists right now, but, to date, no formal approval has been given for the use of this range.

Speaking now of the two proposals that are being studied during the course of the environmental assessment review, first of all, I would like to give you as much information as I can about these. Without getting too involved in it, I will certainly, as the Chairman mentioned, be willing to answer any questions after about these.

The current users that I mentioned have indicated to the Canadian Government a desire to expand their level of activity over the next few years. As well, Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands or Holland towards establishing a long term training program at Goose Bay similar to that conducted by the other countries.

The Royal Netherlands Air Force hopes to conduct a half season training program in 1987 using 10 to 12 F-16 fighter aircraft and about 120 support personnel. The expanded program will continue to be oriented towards low level flying with some night and poor weather flying being done, as required. These last two activities are primarily for training aircrew in the use of special equipment known as terrain-following radar, which is primarily equipment which enables the aircraft to fly at a certain altitude over the ground automatically. This kind of equipment is currently installed in the Tornado aircraft.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is known as the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This is really a fancy name for training done by military aircraft and I will give you a bit of an idea of what this training involves.

First of all, I must say, this project, although it is only a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide details of this proposal, I would like to give a brief background to the NATO Training Centre project.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO Air Forces -- and these are the air forces of western Europe primarily -- is conducted over the densely-populated countries of western Europe with a concentration over the country of West Germany which, for an approximate idea, is about two-thirds of the size of Labrador.

Each year about 538,000 military flights are conducted over Germany, day and night, a country with 63 million people in it. About 110,000 of these flights are low level flights. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities. Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well-trained air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO aircrews.

Nations were asked at the time -- this would be about 1980 -- to submit their training requirements and, based on these statistics, a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an ideal facility, an optimum facility to cater to all of these training requirements. As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full-scope centre was proposed.

The scope of the Training Centre was detailed in a Phase I report, as it is called, submitted to NATO in June of 1983. Two countries have offered potential sites for the location of the Centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and Turkey has offered Konya air base. Site surveys were conducted of each site last year and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group to NATO.

NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country. It is important to understand that that decision in December is not a final decision. This planning and design will take into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operating restrictions which might directly influence the design. Some of those restrictions and environmental considerations will result from the course of this study that is being done. This planning phase is due to be completed by December 1988. During this phase, if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered during the planning or during the negotiations, then the alternate site will be considered.

The Training Centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's barring any major delays.

Now, some details about the scope of this NATO Centre. The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project in its optimum full scale would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting up to 200 sorties or flights each day for 20 two week detachments each year or, in other words, for about 40 weeks of the year. Each two week detachment would require up to 45 flights by transport aircraft every two weeks to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 aircrew and 1,300 ground support personnel transiting through Goose Bay every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multinational base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three year postings into the area, many of them could be expected to bring their familiies, thus further swelling the population by about 1,000 to 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operation centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer product stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing facilities on the airfield such as a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and distribution system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibily necessitating an extension of the current shipping season in Lake Melville or possibly an expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system.

As far as the types of training activity which could be carried out, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model. That is, it is an idea, an proposal that has been put forth. No specific details have been done yet because that is in the next phase.

As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detail, design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it to say that, as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several training activities depending on their dedicated role. These might be low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance, air combat training at medium to high altitudes including supersonic flight, electronic warfare training using onboard and ground-based electronic equipment, practice weapons delivery on an optimum of our ranges similar to that which exists right now, live weapons delivery on an optimum of three ranges, tactical air support of Maritime operations which is a fancy word for anti-shipping, and last but not least, what we call flag-type exercises. What these are are large exercises involving many aircraft of different types all flying together towards a common goal.

Several of these requirements that I have mentioned are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes a sea range for the anti-shipping role that I mentioned, which is merely an area where aircraft can conduct manoeuvers against naval-type shipping. Occasionally, they would fire at targets towed by these ships. Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example of the desirable only feature would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it were established at all.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges, technology has advanced to the stage that there exists today a capability to conduct weapons training during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets on the ground without any kind of weapons coming off the aircraft. This system, known as a no-drop bomb scoring system, has many obvious advantages such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance or weapons expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex.

Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis. By cleaned up I mean any unexploded weapons are taken care of, they are not left on the ground.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope or size of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full scope optimum facility was examined during this study, as was defined in the Phase I report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative, as any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular operation phase. During the site surveys conducted last year by the NATO working group, the towns of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville were examined as being possible alternate airfield locations. Alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergency or poor weather diversion. In some cases an alternate airfield could be used to launch a small number of aircraft to act as opposition aircraft or adversary aircraft. Such utilization of these airfields would require some limited upgrading, such as runway extensions, refuelling systems and possibly some accommodations.

The working group is focusing their attention on locating the NATO Training Centre on the existing northern training area. The southern area, as it exits today, would still be used primarily for low-flying training.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I must emphasize that expansion proposals which have been discussed and studied to date are based on the assumption that a full scale training centre would be constructed. However, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military projects like I have described are not exempt.

As actual planning and design details are worked out over the next few years and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am willing to take any questions at this time. I will apologize at this time if my presentation was a bit slow. We do have two languages being translated at the same time and it is important for their sake that this kind of information is put forth. So, my apologies to those English-speaking people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. Would anyone like to ask Major McCabe any questions about the project? If somebody would like to ask a question, I would ask you to use one of the microphones standing on the floor and would you please give your name clearly for the record before you begin to speak.

Would anyone care to ask a question? Yes, Mr. Koneak?

MR. G. KONEAK: Oui, monsieur Koneak. J'aurai probablement d'autres questions, en premier j'aimerais demander si il y avait une vraie guerre qui pourrait être votre ennemi et si on devait avoir une guerre qui pourrait être votre ennemi?

MAJOR McCABE: I want to do that in two parts. First of all, I say two parts because this ties in with some concerns that have been expressed in other places. The centre that we are talking about constructing is a training centre, it is not an operational centre such as exist in many parts of Europe. In other words, this is not a place that fighting would be conducted out of. I must make that clear.

In answering the second part of your question, NATO that I refer to, which is the North

Atlantic Treaty Organization consisting of about 16 to 18 nations combined together, it is accepted that the enemy, if you want to call it that, is represented by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. So, I would assume that, really, that is the answer to your question.

MR. G. KONEAK: Thank you.

...real war. Are you just wasting your ammunition on practicing when you should just be saving them for the war?

MAJOR McCABE: No, it is not a waste. I think I could possibly even use a local example. When a person is taught how to use a gun, he must first learn, he must train. So, when he uses his weapon to hunt, in order to save ammunition then by being accurate, by doing his job properly, he must train. That is essential for the kind of thing that we are talking about.

A pilot has to learn how to use his aircraft. The aircraft contains very, very complicated, sophisticated systems which require regular training. Part of that is the use of weapons. So, it is not wasted.

MR. G. KONEAK: ...the last question for now. I am sure somebody else will ask and questions come up only if the person answers back. The questions that are asked may help the people understand a lot better. The first question I asked was not a joke. Also, to make sure that our land is not invaded without our knowledge, all the animals, fish, seals. Keeping those in mind, if you are going to use bombs -- when I heard about it in the Atlantic area, there is fish, seals and, thinking of the migration, to me that is dangerous. Also, low-flying, from what I heard, is 50 feet above the ground. If you go above the lake -- I also heard that when they have low-flying, they drop a few...

I will just explain it in plain English, I guess. The lakes turn oily. Not only that, around the Atlantic areas also where seals are...

With the low-flying aircraft, the hunters that go out on the land, their ears might be affected, their hearing. Keeping in mind that the weather changes a lot, if they cannot land in Goose Bay, would they have to require the landing strip here as well? I would like to know if you have plans to use the Kuujjuaq airstrip as well in the future.

MAJOR McCABE: You have a number of questions and concerns there. I will try to be as brief as possible.

As the Chairman will, I know, explain shortly, the whole purpose of this study is to ensure that during the planning, during the development of such a project, if it goes forth, the primary concern is that the environment is not damaged. That areas to use weapons would be areas where there are not animals and there are not people. It must be understood that we have such facilities in many parts of the world, including Canada. We have a fair idea of the affects on animals and on the living things of the sea, the fish, the seals. We already have some experience and knowledge of that.

However, to ensure that any future development of this kind in Labrador is done properly, that is why this study is being done. That is why we are finding out now before any kind of major development is done. We are finding out now the things that we must look at carefully.

You mentioned the oily substance being put on lakes. That is part of something that will also be examined, to see if it really is true, if it really does come from these aircraft or is it from other aircraft or other sources. This kind of thing will be looked at very carefully.

The last thing you mentioned was possible use of Kuujjuaq for the proposals that I have discussed earlier, the kind of activity at Goose Bay. There has been no consideration at all of using Kuujjuaq as an ultimate airfield or in support of any of these activities.

MR. JACKY KONEAK: Jacky Koneak from Kuujjuaq. The first question: Why are they conducting this in this province? Can they not -- is there not any other place in Canada where they can do this? If something happens to the animals that we live off of, then the blame will go on you.

The first question is: Are there not

any alternate places in Canada that you can do this besides here?

MAJOR McCABE: I did mention that there are other places in Canada where military training is done and has been done for many, many years. These areas are used a great deal. They really do not have the capacity to handle the kind of activity we are talking about here.

As far as your concerns about the animals and any possible effects on them, I have to repeat what I mentioned earlier. This kind of thing we are talking about is not new, it has existed before, we do have a great deal of knowledge and experience about the effects on animals and wildlife in general. From our own opinion -- and I am talking for National Defence here -- we are confident, based on the other areas, that there will be minimal or no adverse effect or detrimental effect. However, because that is only our opinion, that is why, as I said earlier, we are doing this study, to ensure for everybody's peace of mind that there will be no effects.

If, during the course of the study, something comes up that would suggest that there could be a harmful effect, then National Defence will have to change their activities accordingly to reduce that. Does that answer your question?

MR. J. KONEAK: Can you not do this elsewhere? Can you do this elsewhere in another province or in the Northwest Territories? Why do you use this area in particular?

MAJOR McCABE: One of the main reasons is, as I mentioned earlier, Goose Bay has been used for military training for the past 45 years. It is not something new. In fact, the kind of level of activity that I have spoken about that we are proposing does not come close to the same as it used to be. So, this is not something totally new for this area. Some of the types of training are new.

To answer your question, "Could it be done elsewhere?", I suppose it could but we lose the advantages that we see of doing it here: Distance, for one; possible costs involved; many, many reasons. The reason we are looking at Goose Bay is because it has always existed there, as I say, over the past 40 years. We are looking at building back up towards what used to be, it is not something new.

MR. J. KONEAK: My last question: As you mentioned earlier, there will be some benefit to the people up here but I do not really believe that it would benefit the Inuit because, when the military people go anywhere, their only concern is themselves most of the time.

Thank you.

MAJOR McCABE: I think possibly you are making a statement rather than asking a question there.

I did not specifically state that there would be direct benefits to the people of Kuujjuaq, be they Inuit or other residents. That possibility exists in the Goose Bay area of increased employment, without getting into any specifics. Your view that the military is only concerned with itself; I cannot share that view. I can use the example of Goose Bay as it exists today.

In the past there used to be the civilian population, the local people, and there used to be the military. Those days are long gone. The military community that exists in Goose Bay today with people from four nations are very, very much part of the local community. People and their families are involved in all kinds of activities in the community. We do a great deal with the local service clubs, sports activities, many, many things. I say that as a military person who lived in Goose Bay for two years but I say that based on statements from the local people. The military people are very much appreciated at that level, in that area because of their willingness to be involved in the local community, to share their concerns and to share their desires to progress and to develop a certain kind of lifestyle for themselves.

When our people go there, we like to become as much a part of the community as possible so that we can enjoy our time there and enjoy the things that the local people like, the wilderness for example. We do not keep ourselves to ourselves, separate from the local community.

MR. J. KONEAK: I was referring to Kuujjuaq not Goose Bay.

MR. PIERRE MARCHAND: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions I would like to address to Major McCabe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, I wonder if you would give your name for the record?

MR. MARCHAND: I am sorry. My name is Pierre Marchand, I am Chairman of the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee. I have some questions about past and present flights out of Goose Bay that occur in northern Quebec.

The first one: According to information found in the flight supplement describing low level training areas or LLTA's, 1, 1A, 1B, and 2, it says that those two zones are active from May the 1st to November the 1st. Is that correct?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, that is about the normal flying season. Whenever they are active there is notice put out that they are active. That is the normal season, yes.

MR. MARCHAND: Now, are there any plans to have this training season, for instance, from November the 1st to May the 1st which would mean exercise and training during winter months?

MAJOR McCABE: There has been some indication by the present users of possibly extending the season a tiny bit. I am talking sort of a week or a few weeks at either end. For example, the season is just about finished now in mid-October. The Germans have gone, the Royal Air Force will be finished by next Monday, and we have not gotten to November yet. We have not had any indication of a desire to have the low-flying extended throughout the winter season. That has not been mentioned by anybody.

MR. MARCHAND: Another small question: Are the two low level training areas considered as restricted areas to be avoided by civil aircraft like bush planes, for instance, carrying sport hunters to outfitting camps? Is it a restricted area or is it an area which can be used by pilots flying with caution or proceeding with caution?

MAJOR McCABE: There certainly is not a restriction to anybody using those areas. Those areas are really, if you like, established as a restriction to the military people in that only within those areas are they allowed to fly at a certain altitude. People, as they do today, can come and go as freely as they want in there. Such areas exist in other parts of Canada where military flying takes place and the reason they are in those publications that you mentioned, for example, is, as you have also suggested, to let people know that this kind of activity is going on in there. It is not meant to be a restriction.

The only area that a restriction exists is in that practice weapons range, again whenever it is being used, advance notice is given, obviously, primarily to aircraft. During its use it is recommended there that no overflight to a certain altitude occur in that particular zone. Does that answer your question?

MR. MARCHAND: Yes. The last one: Briefly, in terms of present activities -- I mean activities that we have been seeing for a few years in the region here -- mainly what is the big difference between Area number 2 and those areas 1, 1A and 1B in terms of use or kind of practice that can be observed there? Briefly, what is the difference between those two zones?

MAJOR McCABE: You mean with respect to current activity?

MR. MARCHAND: Well, for instance, it seems that in the northern part of Area number 2 there is a bombing range. This is one thing. But, as far as the Area 1, 1A or 1B is concerned, is there something similar there or is it quite different in terms of activities?

MAJOR McCABE: The northern and southern training areas, the areas 1 and 2, are for exactly the same kind of training, that is low level flying. The reason there are two of them is primarily for weather purposes. If the weather is bad in one, they may be able to go and fly in the other. The reason the northern one has a 1A and 1B, as you can see on the map, is, as I mentioned earlier, those areas touch on or are used occasionally during the caribou migrations and also there is part of the traditional calving area of the George River herd touches into the top of one.

During the appropriate seasons or when we have reports of large concentrations of animals moving through those, we close them off so that there is no military flying in there. We do not have any restriction on the civilian, once again, because we do not control that.

MR. STAS OLPINSKI: Good morning. My name is Stas Olpinski. I am a biologist with the Research Department of Makivik Corporation. Major McCabe, I have numerous questions but I will try to restrict myself.

Firstly, I would ask if you could clarify the distinction between project 1 and project 2 in the sense, specifically. Given that the NATO project is not given the go-ahead, what is to prevent the DND from simply escalating project 1 and making it, in effect, the same thing that you are calling project 2?

MAJOR McCABE: I want to clarify something there. DND is not escalating anything. The Canadian Forces really has no requirement for expanding Goose Bay whatsoever. We, as the executive agent or the sole agent with dealing with the allies, are, in a sense, responsible for what goes on there. It is not a DND requirement, if I can differentiate there.

The difference between the two projects: The first project, the expansion of the current kind of activity is primarily an expansion in the sense of activity rate. The Memorandum of Understanding, the Agreement that all of these people have signed, amongst other things in it, has a limitation on the maximum number of aircraft and people that can be in Goose Bay at any one time. At present, those limits are not -- they are not reaching those, they are not utilizing those. By letting us know that they wish to expand their activity, they are saying that, instead of 10 airplanes, for example, over the next some years, we want to go up to that limit that we are allowed.

Now, to do that it means more activity in the area, more facilities to support that activity. That is the kind of expansion we are talking about. As well, there would be some expansion in range facilities -- yes, that is true -- but not to the kind of training activity that I mentioned with the NATO project. The current users have not indicated any desire to get into that kind of stuff but you have to remember that these same people that are there right now are also part of NATO. So, they are conducting one kind of training here but their people back home are also the same people who are having problems getting the other kind of stuff done.

If the NATO project does not come here, we would assume that it is going to go to Turkey, in which case that training will be done there and we would just have the existing training here. Does that answer your question enough?

MR. OLPINSKI: I suppose so. Given that the NATO project is given the go-ahead, does that mean that the first one would simply be incorporated into the second or would they again still be distinctive projects?

MAJOR McCABE: There has been an indication that they, as far as the current users are concerned, would be distinct, kept separate. I personally find that hard to believe because, in today's economies, it does not make sense to have separate facilities for the same air force on the same airfield to support two separate operations. It does not make sense. I would suggest that if the NATO project comes to Goose Bay, a great deal of the development in the ranges, the development of the facilities would absorb the current operation. That is my opinion.

MR. OLPINSKI: But that is not necessarily the figures. The data that you have quoted regarding the flight numbers, the personnel and the aircraft that are utilized are not necessarily what might occur, given that they are distinct projects. Is that correct?

MAJOR McCABE: That is true. The numbers that I gave you refer specifically to the NATO project. I did put a lot of emphasis on the fact that this is a full-blown, almost an unrestricted kind of a plan that they have. I would suggest, therefore, once again that those numbers may well be less than that.

MR. OLPINSKI: Could you just give me an idea of your mentioning that NATO is comprised of 16 to 18 countries. Given that NATO does come in here,'how many of those countries would be involved; would it be all 16 to 18 or would it be a portion thereof or what?

MAJOR McCABE: No, they would not all be. Once again, a number of those nations are very small, a number of them do not do the kind of training we are talking about. Some of them are so far away that it would not be worth their while for the costs involved. They might -- for example, some of the countries in the Mediterranean, I would suggest, if they did partake, it would be on an extremely limited basis.

MR. OLPINSKI: If I could ask one more question at this point. Given that there were some sort of environmental disaster to occur as a result of some of these flights, is there any sort of a contingency in the sense of compensation given to the people that would be involved? Is there any thought at this point regarding that at all? I mean, it is obviously something very important. Has it been considered?

MAJOR McCABE: Before I answer that, could you be more specific in what you are referring to as an environmental disaster?

MR. OLPINSKI: Okay. If I may -- an environmental disaster, perhaps that is a strong usage of words. Given that there was crashes of aircraft -- you were talking about the flag-type operations or something like that where there is numerous aircraft involved or given that there were live weapons to be used. I mean, there are accidents that do occur. You have not specified what types of live weapons would be used. I am just asking a very general question. Given that something were to happen where people were to be involved specifically, injuries or, again in terms of the environment itself, that there was some sort of damage which directly influenced the lifestyle and the hunting of the people, is there any sort of compensation that would be coming to these people?

MAJOR McCABE: I can only be general in my response to that. The kind of military training that we do in other parts of the country and, indeed, Goose Bay are all done under formal agreements. There are clauses in those agreements that involve the kind of thing that you are talking about; payment for damages, compensatory matters up to a point, they are general. There have been situations in the past, I think, more of populated areas where accidents have happened, civilian aircraft as well as military, where there have been disasters or people who have been affected and compensatory steps have been taken.

I think, really, that answers your question in that it has happened before, they do exist, and I do not see any reason why there would not be such a coverage, if you like, or provisos done in this kind of development.

MR. OLPINSKI: Just one more thing. In Turkey are the same sort of panel discussions taking place currently?

MAJOR McCABE: To the best of my knowledge, no.

MR. OLPINSKI: Thank you.

DR. JACQUES GIGUÈRE: Mon nom est Jacques Giguère du comité consultatif d'environnement Kativik; j'ai simplement une seule question à poser, à savoir quand vous parlez d'augmentation des opérations, de quel ordre de grandeur s'agit-il? Est-ce que c'est une fois, deux fois, trois fois ce qui existe actuellemen ou bien donc vous pouvez le donner aussi en termes de pourcentage? Mais j'aimerais savoir quel ordre de grandeur de plus que ce qu'il y a actuellement?

MAJOR McCABE: I do not know how specific I can get there because of the fact that the NATO project, for example, again I must repeat, is a very large full scale thing which I think has probably little chance of reaching that level of activity. To give you a comparison, I mentioned up to 200 flights a day or 200 sorties a day. During the peak level of activity in the flying season that occurs today where we do not have the maximum number of aircraft there, they can get between 80 to 100 of these flights a day. So, you are seeing an increase of maybe twice as much but I have to emphasize that those 200 sorties a day are not all low-flying. Possibly only 10 per cent of that would be in the low-flying area. Much of it would be high level, some possibly over the ocean because of the different roles the aircraft have.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a person in the middle on the right-hand side who indicated a long time ago that he wanted to speak. I wonder if he might go first, please?

MR. WILLIE GORDON: Willie Gordon. A lot of Native people in Labrador and Quebec are being affected by this project. The Inuit people can say that, since Canada is a large country, we can tell you that there is other places. For example, in the Northwest Territories there is a lot of land where it is not occupied or being hunted on by the Inuit. I remember in World War II the Inuit were affected because there was starvation among Inuit because they did not have any animals to hunt any more.

It seems like the Americans and the Russians are going towards a real war. They had a meeting in Iceland and they did not agree on a lot of things. They did not come up with an agreement that is reasonable. I can say that the Russians are doing the same thing. I am very concerned about these projects that are being conducted just outside our community. I know of areas in Canada where there is nobody and I want you to consider that very well Turkey and other countries. Thank you.

MAJOR McCABE: Sir, I am not sure what your question is. Could you be more specific?

MR. GORDON: I am asking you, if we have no more meat to eat anywhere around these areas that you are disturbing the calving grounds and, if we have no more caribou migration, are you going to guarantee us that you are going to feed us for free?

MAJOR McCABE: I am obviously not in any kind of a position to make any guarantees of that kind. I would suggest that, as a reminder once again, there has been military flying for the past 40 years in Goose Bay. In the past 20-odd years the George River herd has increased from around the 50,000/60,000 mark to well over 600,000. I would suggest that to date there has been no specific suggestion that the military flying is in danger of wiping out the existing caribou herd. Once again, those kinds of possible effects are being studied right now in separate studies and also will be covered during the course of this study.

MR. GORDON: Right now I have reason to believe that you are already disturbing the area; now you are coming closer than you ever have before. I think we would appreciate something that is a written guarantee that you are going to feed us for free at least, if we have no more meat after.

MAJOR McCABE: I must say, sir, I do not share your view about the caribou. This is where we do military training in Canada and my knowledge of the animal populations in those areas. I do not see — what you are considering or suggesting, I do not see it as a possibility. Therefore, I obviously cannot give you any kind of guarantee of what you are asking.

MR. GORDON: I think there was one biologist there, Northcott I think it was. If you would like to see these forms that we have from MLCP of radio data, of where they are going and where they calve, I have them here.

Another question I would like to have for the gentleman there is if he is actually going to show us on the map where they are going to be flying. They have one area that they have already marked but already he said, we may be flying over the ocean. Is he already getting out of range from where he said he would be flying?

MAJOR McCABE: The use of the ocean that I mentioned ties in with the NATO project and, again, I have to come back to emphasize that, because there has not been a location selected yet, Goose Bay or Turkey; no specific planning and design has taken place. During the study last year a very general overview was done of possible areas but that was over a three or four day period, it was not done by the experts, shall we say, and there were no commitments made at that time. Therefore, we only have a very general idea of where they would like to see various things established.

Before any of that commitment is made, detailed information has to be made available on environmental, archeological uses, et cetera, et cetera. All of that has to be studied carefully before any kind of commitment for specific areas can be made.

MR. GORDON: Is there going to be any penalties or any kind of written reports to the community that, if these people are going off course and flying all over northern Quebec or if the Army is going to supply the community where they have been flying and where they have made mistakes -- I am not saying it is going to but I have reason to believe that it might affect the calving ground.

Thank you.

MAJOR McCABE: The military flying that is done right now -- I mentioned the Co-ordination Centre -- every flight that is done, a pilot must file a flight plan exactly the same as any civilian pilot is supposed to file a flight plan of where he is going. It is from those flight plans we are able to find out who has been responsible for any violations that may have happened.

I do want to state that the flying restrictions and regulations that apply to military pilots also apply to civilian pilots and vice versa. We fly under Canadian flight regulations. Even though these people come from other countries, they must abide by our regulations. People do fly outside of those areas that are indicated on the map but they must fly at higher altitudes. They are certainly permitted to fly out there but they have to abide by the same regulations that civilians do. So, if people see military aircraft flying by a community on the coast, it is expected, from our point of view, that(a) we know he is going to be there because he has filed a flight plan and also that he is obeying the rules.

For example, he cannot fly over a community lower than 2,000 feet. That may appear to be low, but that regulation applies exactly the same to civilians as well. We expect our people to obey those rules.

MR. JOHNNY PETERS: My name is Johnny Peters. I am representing Makivik. At the moment I am going to speak personally.

Avez-vous des projets, des prévisions pour utiliser la puissance nucléaire à l'avenir? L'énergie nucléaire vous avez dit la puissance nucléaire, mais peut-être que vous voulez dire les armes nucléaires. Qu'est-ce-que vous voulez dire? Les armes nucléaires? Ou l'énergie nucléaire?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: I heard the translation as nuclear power. I think possibly you are talking nuclear weapons, though, are you not, or do you mean nuclear power?

MR. J. PETERS: Je parle des armes nucléaires. Avez-vous des projets d'utiliser de tels armements à l'avenir? Non, nous n'avons aucun projet d'utiliser les armements nucléaires, nous n'avons aucun armement nucléaire en terrain en terre canadienne et nous avons aucun projet d'en amener à à l'avenir lié à ce projet ou a un autre projet au Canada.

MAJOR McCABE: No, there is no plans whatsoever. Nuclear weapons -- we do not have any nuclear weapons on Canadian soil at this time and there are certainly no plans whatsoever to have nuclear weapons in the future involved with this project or any other project in Canada.

MR. PETERS: Personellement, je suis parmi ceux qui ne sont contre ce projet, qui ne veule pas que ce projet se rapproche de nous. Je pense que puisse que plusieurs pays sont impliqués dans l'OTAN je pense que vous pouvez trouver un autre pays où vous pouvez faire cet entraînement. Je suis parmi ceux qui sont contre ce projet sur notre territoire étant donné que nous dépendons des animaux et que déjà vous intensifiez en autant que possible j'aimerais que vous aillez ailleurs, dans un autre pays.

MAJOR McCABE: One of the main reasons that they are looking for such a site for the NATO site is because there is no room in any other country. That is why there are only two countries that have offered to host this project. When this project first came out, they ideally wanted to have it in Europe but

there is nowhere to build a facility the size that they wanted to do.

As far as it may be better going to Turkey, obviously as a Canadian I would not prefer that but I do not make the decisions on where that goes. Just for information, I mentioned that the recommendation has already been made and is going through a review process in NATO towards the decision in December. That recommendation is favouring Turkey. We would hope that it is going to be changed.

Just for information, the area in Turkey that is proposed or being offered has one and a half million people in it. There are some obvious differences in the areas we are talking about.

MR. PETERS: (Interpretation not available).

MAJOR McCABE: There may well be other areas in Canada that theoretically do not have any people in them or do not have any animals in them. However, no other areas have been considered or offered and are not going to be. If, during the course of this study or during the course of the deliberations made by NATO, the decision is made that the Centre will not go to Goose Bay, then that will probably be the end of it. In the meantime, we have also the other proposal that we are considering and that is the current operation. We would assume that that is going to continue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody else

who would like to ask a question? Yes.

MS CAMILLE MAGEAU: Camille Mageau, Member of the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee. I have a question to you, Major McCabe. It concerns the activities that you have listed. You have given us a whole series of potential activities which might be taking place out of the Training Centre, if it does end up in Goose Bay. There still seems to be some uncertainty as to what exactly will the activities be that will occur over the northern Quebec territory and I think if we could get some kind of statement from you as to what we can expect, what the people locally can expect happening, whether you will have any of the three ranges for the weapons delivery or for the -- I cannot remember, what was the other one -- the practice ranges. Is that information going to be specifically given in the EIS; are you going to be providing alternatives or at least giving us an idea of where they will be as opposed to just telling us some of this may happen if we get the base or if we get the Training Centre in Goose Bay. At what point do we get specifics?

MAJOR McCABE: Specifics will be provided when we have them. A lot of people do not seem to understand when I say that the NATO project is a proposal. We have an idea based on a report that was written that suggests this is the kind of thing that will be required. That report does not make any specific reference to any location. They have done a feasibility study on each of the locations to see whether it is feasible to establish some semblance of a centre there based on that initial criteria. When that decision is made is when they sit down and they start examining what can go where, if it can go at all.

We just do not have any details of the specifics that you are asking for. When we know about that and, of course, with the results of the various environmental studies that are being done -- environmental, socio-economic and other related things, the health studies -- when we have the results of those and we have specifics from those, we will be applying that information to the design and planning phase of the Centre.

For example, you mentioned the ranges. I have seen -- this working group drew some circles on a map as part of an overall scenario. The chances of those ranges going to those spots are extremely remote because they were just done, as I say, over a matter of hours almost to get just a rough idea of whether the overall thing is feasible. All of the specific use areas would have to be examined in detail on-site by specialists before any kind of approval or establishment would occur. We just do not have the details that a lot of people want right now because it is too early in the phasing, it is too early in the design of this thing.

Does that help out a bit? We are not

trying to hide anything, we just do not have that information yet.

MS CAMILLE MAGEAU: I am not saying you are trying to hide anything, I am just wondering, then -- a question to the Chairman -- how do you view this conceptual project? Do you anticipate any problems in being able to do an assessment of potential impacts of a concept when you will be given criteria for selection for sites as opposed to specific sites and specific environments and specific resource usages for those areas. Do you think that, from a process point of view, you will be able to do it?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is not unusual for a panel to be faced with having to conduct a review of a project at a conceptual design stage. It has happened before and I am sure it will happen again. Part of the reason for doing a review like this, I believe, is to provide information of an environmental nature to be part of the planning process so that the outcome of the environmental review can be used in preparing the detailed design of the project. Now, that can probably be carried only so far. It is certainly our hope that, by the time National Defence is ready to submit its Environmental Impact Statement, a great deal more information will be available than is now. In fact, I would hope that more information than is presently available can be provided to the public long before this submission of the Environmental Impact Statement.

I suppose that when the time comes, that is when we have the Impact Statement in our hands, we will have to make a judgment whether in fact we have enough information at that time to complete a report to the government, as we have been directed to do. I believe that is the best way that I can answer that question at the present time.

I believe we could allow time for perhaps one more question before we break for lunch, if anybody else would like to come forward. All right, come ahead.

MS MAGEAU: It was noted earlier that the Forces will only be using the Goose Bay area in summertime and someone made the crack, are we not expecting a wintertime war. Or, do we relocate?

MAJOR McCABE: The statement was not made that we are only using it during the summertime. The season runs from about the beginning of March to, say, the end of October. From my own experience there is a fair bit of snow on the ground in that time. In fact, it is one of the things we are using to encourage the allies to use Goose Bay during that period because it gives them -- a lot of these air forces have commitments in northern Europe, extreme northern Europe. Training here gives them an opportunity to train their ground personnel, to see how the aircraft function in colder weather and to train the aircrews as well. So, in fact, there are advantages to training there for exactly the reason you are saying.

We are very well aware that, unfortunately from past history, wars do not take weather and seasonal influences into account.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank Major McCabe for his presentation and for responding to all those questions. I would like also to thank all of you who have come forward and asked the questions because this is certainly one of the best discussions we have had so far in all of these meetings about this project.

When we come back after lunch -- we will start at about two o'clock and at that time I will talk about the work that the Panel is doing, what has happened so far in the process and what will happen next. After that we will then begin to hear presentations from the people of Kuujjuaq.

Thank you very much.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

---Upon Resuming at 2:15 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Barnes and I am Chairman of this Panel. I wish to welcome you here this afternoon. This morning we heard something about the project. There were a lot of good questions and a lot of discussion.

I think with that in mind, I would like to say something now about the process of the review in which we are involved. Before beginning, there are three persons whom I would like to introduce to you because they are very important to the work of this Panel. I refer to the Members of the Secretariat to the Panel, who work very hard in compiling and presenting information to the Panel, in making arrangements for meetings and doing a great number of other things without which the Panel could not operate.

First of all, the Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. Would you stand, please? Thank you. He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon at the back and Mr. Jim Clarke.

If you wish to obtain any more information about this process, if you are not on the mailing list for this review, if you would like to receive information from our office about the environmental assessment process or if you would like to obtain an official transcript of this meeting or any other meetings that we have been holding, please go and speak to any of these three gentlemen and they will take care of you.

First of all, a little background to this review. This review is going on because in 1973 the Government of Canada decided that it wished to improve the process of planning for development projects for which the Government of Canada is responsible. It wanted to increase the amount of public consultation, public involvement in that process of planning before it makes decisions on those projects. So, at that time, the Government established a process which is known as the Environmental Assessment and Review Process.

That process has within it certain procedures that a Panel such as this one is expected to follow. Beyond that, a Panel has a fair degree of independence with regard to the detailed procedures that it uses and is, as far as is possible, independent of the government. As the Chairman of the Panel, I report directly to the Minister of the Environment, rather than to my supervisor at the office where I carry on my other work.

In February of 1986 the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment and described the project which you have heard about already this morning. At the same time it asked the Minister to begin a public environmental review of the project. During the spring of this year staff of our office, in consultation with people from other departments of government and other sources, looked for suitable candidates for appointment to the Panel.

This is done, first of all, by looking at what are likely to be the most important issues, the most important subjects that will have to be studied in their review. An attempt is then made to identify candidates for the Panel who possess certain experience, certain knowledge, certain expertise which would be valuable to the work of the Panel in examining these subjects.

So, a list of candidates was put together, this was submitted to the Minister of the Environment and in July of 1986 the Minister appointed this Panel. At that same time, the Minister gave to the Panel its instructions on how to carry out the review and, in a general way, the subjects that the Panel was to examine. These instructions are contained in the document called the Terms of Reference which has already been distributed to the public and which is available on request.

The first important task that any Panel has to do after it has been appointed is to prepare a list of instructions to the proponent -- which is in this case, of course, the Department of National Defence -- instructions on how to prepare a document known as the Environmental Impact Statement, which will be one of the most important documents in this whole review.

The Panel looked at a great deal of information which had already been gathered for it and, after deliberating for some time, published a draft document which we call Guidelines. The Guidelines document will contain those instructions that I mentioned a few moments ago on how the Department of National Defence will write the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are presently holding a series of

meetings in 17 locations in Quebec and in Labrador. The main reason for holding these meetings is to listen to whatever comments any interested people may wish to make on the contents of that draft document. We are doing this so that we can satisfy ourselves that the final form of the Guidelines document, when we present it to National Defence, will be as good as it can be and will cover all of the correct subject matter.

I would like for a few minutes then to talk about that Draft Guidelines document itself because there are probably people amongst you who have not had an opportunity to look at it.

The document begins with several definitions of terms that we use in a review like this. These terms are defined so that there is no question about the meaning of those terms as we intend to use them in this review.

Then, following some general introductory comments, the Guidelines document talks about the scope of the review and says in the opening paragraph of that section that these guidelines are to apply to the entire project, including all of the activities associated with the construction, with the operations, with the maintenance and with the possible closedown and demobilization of the project. As you have already heard this morning, the project consists of two separate parts and in the Environmental Impact Statement National Defence is expected to treat those two parts separately to a great extent.

The next section of the Guidelines document gives instructions to the proponent on the methods to be used in carrying out studies, in gathering information and in writing the document. It points out that the Panel has identified a number of important issues, important subject areas that are to be examined. These are the subjects which the Panel at the present time feels are the ones that need very close attention in this Environmental Impact Statement. The panel realizes that in the course of these meetings interested people may tell us about other subjects which are also important and we are quite prepared to add those to the list of issues which we have already identified.

I am now going to read to you the nine subjects which the Panel has already identified. Number one, the effects of noise from low-flying aircraft on humans and on the wildlife; number two, the effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use; number three, the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the project area; number four, the impacts of the project on commercial activities that are based on renewable resources; number five, the impacts on the natural environment of construction activities associated with expansion of Goose Bay airport and impacts on the natural environment of emissions, exhaust emissions from increased flying activities.

Number six, the combined effects of this project and of other projects and activities that may be going on in the region; number seven, the possible need for monitoring, that is for watching out for effects coming from the project in its various stages. For example, environmental effects of construction activities or environmental effects from operational phases of the project. Number eight, the impacts of weapons and training ranges, such as we heard of this morning; number nine is the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims. Now, I should point here that in the instructions given to the Panel by the Minister of the Environment, it is made clear that the Panel is not being asked to study or to reach conclusions about the policy of the Government of Canada with regard to Native land claims.

At the same time, the Panel realizes -- so many people have pointed out to us that the project may have some effect on the outcome of land claims negotiations -- that this subject must be included in the list of issues that the Panel is including in the Guidelines document.

The final section of the Guidelines presents instructions to the Department of National Defence on the form or structure and the contents of the Environmental Impact Statement. The first section of that Impact Statement will have to present a summary of the entire document. That summary would bring together the most important findings of the Impact Statement and present them in such a way that readers will be able to focus immediately on the major projected impacts from the project, for example. This summary will be produced in English and in French and in a sufficient number of languages and dialects to meet the needs of the following groups: The Inuit of Kuujjuaq and Kangiqsualujjuaq, the Inuit of Labrador, the Naskapis of Quebec, the Montagnais of Schefferville and the lower north shore of Quebec, and the Naskapi/Montagnais/Innu of Labrador.

The Guidelines say that the Environmental Impact Statement will have to present the justification for the project, a statement of why the project is needed at all. We realize that both the Panel and the public need a better understanding of the justification for the project to use as a background to the examination of the projected impacts of the project.

The Impact Statement will have to discuss other projects. This includes projects that may be directly associated with the military flying activities which you heard about or they may be other projects that may already exist or may be planned to be carried out within any of the areas that may be affected by the project. This is necessary in order that the Panel and the public can understand any combined or cumulative impacts or interactions that may arise from them.

There will also have to be a discussion of alternatives. That is, other ways of achieving the same purpose other than have been described. For example, this might include other possible sites for runways, other flying areas and perhaps the use of other flights training techniques in addition to low level flight training.

The next section of the Impact Statement will present a description of the project in as much detail as will be available at that time. There is already on paper a description of the project. That is, the description that was presented to the Minister of Environment in February of 1986. After examining that, the Panel has decided that there is a need for additional information. Some of the information that the Panel has requested has already been presented by Major McCabe, other information will be presented to the Panel in writing in the near future, so I understand.

The description of the project will, of course, describe the low level flight training that has been going on now for several years. It will describe the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for NATO, which has already been described this morning, and it will also present information on weapons ranges which might be needed either under the existing flight training or an expanded version of that existing flight training or might be needed also under the NATO Training Centre.

In order to understand what effects the project may have on the environment, we will need to have a good understanding of exactly what that present environment is. This would be the subject of the next section of the Impact Statement.

The Guidelines request that the proponent present information about the present environment under various subject headings, such as geology, land forms, the climate, the quality of the air, the quality of the water, fish, sea mammals, birds, land animals and plants. In addition to that, we will require information on the people, their background, how they live, how they earn their living. For example, we are requesting information on the distribution and the characteristics of human populations in the area, information on their economic, their cultural and the social setting.

Because low level flight training has been going on since 1980, we are requesting in the Guidelines an evaluation of the social and the economic impacts of that flight training since 1980. We also want information on the use of the natural resources of the area, both in the past and in the present, as well as a prediction of that resource use in the future. There is a request for information on means of travel and communicating within the area, information on commercial aviation, information on the movements of aircraft at Goose Bay Airport in each of the last six years during which low level flight training has been carried on.

The proponent will be requested to provide information on special areas such as bird sanctuaries, areas of historic importance or of importance for some other reason. We will require a description of the development plan for the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay and, because of the importance of land claims negotiations and the possible effect of the project on those, we are asking for a description of the present situation regarding land claims negotiations involving all Native groups.

Following that, having already described the project and the existing environment, the developer will be required to predict what the impacts will be coming from the project on that environment. That is, effects on what we call the natural environment and effects on the human environment, on the communities.

In particular, we ask that this section include a discussion of the impacts of a possible closedown of the project, if that should happen.

Next comes perhaps one of the most important sections of the Environmental Impact Statement and that is a proposal by National Defence on what measures it would plan to take to either enhance or prolong any beneficial impacts coming from the project or, on the other hand, to eliminate or reduce any harmful impacts. These mitigative measures, as we call them, have to be proposed to deal with whichever impact that it is possible to devise them for. The proponent will be expected to identify who will be responsible for such mitigative measures and also who would be responsible for any damages that might be caused by the project, including any that might be caused by personnel or by equipment belonging to a non-Canadian organization. I think the question came up this morning that related to this.

After National Defence has identified possible mitigative measures in this way, there may be certain impacts which·will remain no matter what the proponent or anyone else might do to offset them. There may be impacts which would be left, which we would call residual impacts. The proponent will be expected to discuss those and discuss what they mean in terms of harm to the environment.

Finally then, there would be a need for a proposed program of monitoring. I mentioned this earlier. The developer would be expected to describe and to identify the responsibility for a program of monitoring that would be intended to achieve three objectives. First of all, we would expect a need to monitor to test the accuracy of the impacts that had already been predicted; to identify and to evaluate impacts that might occur during construction or operation which had not been foreseen at the time of the Impact Statement; and finally, monitoring to test the effectiveness of the mitigative measures.

That, very briefly, is an outline of the contents of the Guidelines. When all of these meetings are over at the end of October, the Panel will sit down and will discuss all of the information which it has gathered during these meetings, will look again at the Draft Guidelines document, which I have just described, and will decide where any changes need to be made in that document to make it better.

When it is finished, the Panel will present the Guidelines to the Department of National Defence and that will probably happen in December of this year. National Defence will then begin to prepare its Impact Statement. In order to do that, they will have to gather a great deal of information that already exists in a great many places, they may have to undertake some new studies because information may be absent in the case of certain subjects. When they have done all that, the Department will write the Environmental Impact Statement. All of this will take a number of months.

At the present time, we expect the Impact Statement might be ready to be delivered to the Panel sometime in late spring or early summer of 1987. The Impact Statement will immediately be made available to the public so that, at the same time that the Panel will be examining the Impact Statement and the Government will be also examining the Impact Statement, the public will also have an opportunity over the same period of time to examine it, to decide whether they think it is a satisfactory document or whether it is not.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement has responded properly to the Guidelines and it meets the needs of the Panel as stated in those Guidelines, the Panel will announce a series of public hearings to discuss the project. At the present time, we believe that the most likely time for those hearings to be held would be in the fall of 1987. During those hearings the Panel would go, as we are doing now, around to many locations, would meet with the residents of those communities and would speak with them about the Environmental Impact Statement, would hear from the people how they feel about that document.

Then, when the hearings are over, the Panel will write its own report, a report which would be presented to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence. That report from the Panel will give those Ministers the opinion of the Panel on the environmental acceptability of the project. It will discuss the predicted impacts, it will discuss measures which National Defence has proposed to deal with the impacts and will make recommendations to the Ministers on the two major parts of the project as has been described. We hope that that report of the Panel would be ready to present to the Government perhaps late in 1987 or early in 1988.

That, then, outlines the process that we are involved in and the Guidelines document which is the subject of these meetings. I should mention that in most of these meetings, in addition to hearing comments on the Guidelines document, we have had time to hear presentations of other kinds from various interested parties.

Even if somebody does not have particular comments to make on the Guidelines document itself, we will welcome anything else that you wish to say because contained within that may be some information which the Panel can use in deciding how it needs to improve the Draft Guidelines to make the final document.

I would be glad to try to answer any questions which anyone might have now about the review process or anything else that I have spoken about.

Yes, sir? Would you please give your name for the record?

MR. JACQUES GIGUÈRE: My name is Jacques Giguère from the Comité consultatif de l'environnement. Voici, vous avez dit monsieur Barnes que le département de la défense nationale écrirait l'étude d'impact, autrement dit est-ce que cette étude d'impact va être écrite par le département lui-même ou bien donc si vous allez engager un consultant et, actuellement, est-ce que ce consultant-là a été choisi?

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, sir, but we had a problem with the interpretation. I wonder if you would mind repeating your question. I am very sorry.

MR. GIGUERE: It is regarding the Impact Statement. You said that the Department of National Defence is going to write the Impact Statement itself. My question is: Is it going to be written by the Department itself or are they going to hire a consultant to write it and, if so, has the consultant been chosen yet?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would imagine that National Defence would, indeed, intend to hire one or more consultants to help it in preparing the Impact Statement. Perhaps Major McCabe could reply to that question better than I can.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. An independent consultant will be hired and, in fact, any sub-specialists that are required by that consultant company. In effect, the Guidelines that are presented to the Department of National Defence by the Panel will, in turn, be given to this consultant group. The specific consultant firm has not been hired or decided on at this time. We are considering several possibilities but no decision has been made yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Yes?

MR. JACKY KONEAK: (Interpretation not

available).

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry but the interpreter had a bit of difficulty with your question. Could I ask you to say it over again?

MR. KONEAK: I will speak in English, then.

I would like to ask -- I know that the Panel would like to do a very good job of giving proper information to the people who make decisions in Ottawa. I would like to ask: Has the decision not already been made to go ahead with the project?

THE CHAIRMAN: I hate to keep passing on responsibility, but I think Major McCabe might be able to answer that question better than I.

MAJOR McCABE: No, the decision has not been made. The only government commitment, if you like, has been to offer Goose Bay as a potential site for the NATO project. That is with respect to the one proposal. The other proposal that is being considered, of course, is the expansion of the current activity and, in that sense, there is already a commitment made there but the Panel has different mandates for those two proposals and that is why they are different.

The decision has not been made already, despite what some people might think. We are very much at the mercy, if you like, of the Environmental Impact Statement and its findings. The Statement mad to the Ministers of Environment and National Defence will affect the outcome of that project.

MR. KONEAK: I would just like to make another statement. I feel that my future is in the hands of the Department of National Defence. I have children to feed, we feed daily from caribou, fish, migratory birds, seals and I am opposed to the project.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your statement. Again, I apologize for a temporary problem with the interpretation. I think we have that solved now.

Would the next person come forward, please?

MR. PIERRE MARCHAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Pierre Marchand, I am Chairman of the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee.

I have a specific question that is quite important for our group. If some groups or organizations want to see some changes in the mandate of the present Panel here, do they have to or can they give their request directly to the Panel or should they address this request directly to the Minister of the Environment?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe it would be appropriate for you to give it directly to the Panel. We have already received requests at other locations for the Panel to consider asking for a change in its mandate. What we have said on those occasions is that we will accept those requests and suggestions and, once these meetings are over and we sit down to prepare the final Guidelines, we will also consider these requests and decide whether we want to approach the Minister of Environment and ask that the mandate be changed in any way. So, we would be glad to receive directly from you any suggestions of that nature.

I have just had a suggestion from another Member of the Panel that there would probably be nothing wrong at all in making such a request to the Panel and, in addition, corresponding directly with the Minister of the Environment as well because our mandate comes from him. So, do as you wish.

Would anyone else care to ask a question about the process or the review?

If not, then, I -- oh, excuse me. Do you wish to ask a question? Would you give your name for the record, please?

MR. JIMMY JOHANNES: Je suis de Kuujjuaq. J'aimerais poser une question. J'aimerais savoir si même après que vous aurez entendu nos préoccupations, est-ce que le projet va quand même être poursuivi?

THE CHAIRMAN: That really is a question that I am not able to answer. The Panel has been asked only to conduct the review to examine all of the important questions and to make recommendations to the Government. The Panel does not have any power to approve or disapprove the project. So, I would not want to make any comment on what the decision of the Government might be afterwards.

MR. JOHANNES: Je vous remercie. Egalement, j'aimerais dire que des gens ont parlé de nos enfants, de leur avenir à l'heure actuelle je peux dire que notre vie a déjà été affectée et si le projet continue, cela vous nous affecter encore davantage...

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. We will certainly take note of what you said and we thank you.

Would anybody else like to say something or ask a question? Yes?

MR. STAS OLPINKSI: My name is Stas Olpinski. I am a biologist with the Research Department of Makivik Corporation.

I am wondering, is there a channel for voicing the peoples' opinions; would something like petitions to appropriate government agencies be of value; and, ultimately, does anybody have a veto power about this? I think that has been a major concern raised by everybody here. Who is making the final decisions, and is there a person who has a veto power, and could this person be written to to voice personal concerns other than just this type of a meeting?

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under the democratic system in which we live, decisions of this sort are made by the people whom we elect to make them. The ultimate responsibility for making this sort of decision, I would presume, would rest with the Minister of National Defence and with his colleagues in the Federal Cabinet. It is all part of the political process.

This Panel is going to do its part in providing both the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence and all of the Cabinet with information concerning environmental issues related to this project. I would expect that they would also receive a great deal of other kinds of information from other sources and would put it all together when the time comes for them to make the decision.

I would not want to recommend one way or the other but I would think that anyone is free at any time to write to the appropriate persons and try to influence their decisions, that that would not have anything at all to do with the review in which we are involved here, with the work of this Panel.

Another question?

MR. PIERRE MARCHAND: My name is Pierre Marchand, Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee. I have two questions relating to Item 6.6 and Item 6.8

of the Table of Contents which refer to mitigative measures and monitoring program.

First, who would monitor or supervise the implementation of mitigative measures; and the second question is who would make sure that the monitoring program is conducted in the proper way?

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to the mitigative measures, it would depend on which would be the most appropriate agency to implement those. It might be something that the Department of National Defence would be expected to do or it might be something that some other department in government would be expected to do. This is something that we would expect the Impact Statement to give some guidance on.

With regard to the monitoring, again some of it might be the responsibility of National Defence; some might be the responsibility of another government department, perhaps one of the regulatory departments. If an item of a monitoring program were to be carried out by the Department of National Defence, I am sure that another appropriate agency would be identified to work with it and to make sure that the monitoring is carried out in the intended way and that the data coming out of the program was reported regularly, as required.

I do not know if that fully answers your question or not, or did you have something else in mind? That is normally the way these things happen.

If there are no other questions, I believe we could begin to receive -- oh, we have one. Come forward, please?

MR. JOSEPH AGMA: I am Joseph Agma. You, as Commission, I would like to ask a question. As you mentioned earlier, these things that are different are the impacts. When could these take place? Like, for example, if you do a study on the harvesting impact, like for example in our research -- not research, our wildlife management, my question is would you let the wildlife management know what you intend to do?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that I understand entirely what your question is. Are you asking whether the studies that would be conducted for the Environmental Impact Statement would be made known to the public; is that your question?

MR. AGMA: Maybe perhaps if I try to speak English, it would make more sense.

I would like to ask you as a Panel, you mentioned earlier that you wanted to conduct different research in order to find out what kind of impact there will be on this project. So, my question is: When would you start this kind of research studies and would you be consulting organizations that have specifically the same objectives in Inuit communities?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I think I understand now. I apologize again for the problem wit the interpretation.

First of all, the studies that are needed to produce the information that the Panel will need will not be conducted by the Panel itself. There are some studies that are already in progress now that were started even before the Panel was appointed. There are, I am sure, other studies going on that perhaps we do not even know about yet. Whatever studies that are identified by the Panel that are needed and that will be carried out for the purpose of the Environmental Impact Statement will be conducted by the Department of National Defence. We are expecting them to follow our Guidelines and to look, everywhere that it is appropriate to look, to find information that could assist them in writing that Impact Statement.

Certainly, if there are studies going on, if there have been studies in the past that have produced information that would be useful in this, we would expect National Defence to seek out those studies and their results in the course of producing the Impact Statement. I think the answer to your question is, yes.

Tape 8

Would you care to add anything to that, Major McCabe? No. Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. JOHNNY PETERS: I thought I was pretty clear on what was going on this morning but I would like to ask you again. This morning I thought it was pretty clear that this project is going on already because one of my staff was in Goose Bay and he told me that he saw a whole lot of planes coming in for landing. Now, you are saying that only after these studies will this project go on. I am not clear on this any more. You say that this has been going on since 1980 and we have been having various meetings on that through the co-ordinating committee as well and one of the members here has been present at our meetings before. Now, you tell me that only after these various studies will the project go ahead. I do not think you can hide anything like that. You are giving me two different stories on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is important to understand here what was contained in the description of the project that we heard this morning. There are two parts to the projects which the Panel is examining. One is, as you say, the low level flight training activities that have been going on since 1980.

In the case of those activities, the Panel has been asked to look at them to determine whether there are any environmental effects being caused by those activities and, in particular, if there are any harmful effects, we have been asked to recommend to the Minister ways in which those effects could be eliminated or, at least, reduced.

The intention is that these activities would continue and perhaps might be expanded. So, even if the activities have been going, it might be possible and necessary to do certain things to reduce any environmental effects that are being caused by these activities.

The other part of the project, the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, has not started yet so we have an opportunity to project in advance what the environmental effects are likely to be, and to recognize ways in which these effects could be managed.

I believe we will have time for one more short question.

MR. STAS OLPINSKI: Who are the consultants that will be undertaking the assessment, the environmental assessment? Which agency? And if it is the Department of National Defence that is appointing the consultants, I want to say that I believe that is a blatant case of conflict of interest.

We, as the Makivik Corporation, being a research organization, are involved in the processes of studying the environmental impact.

I am not sure that you have understood what I am saying.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. What you say is correct. The assessment is to be carried out by the Department of National Defence because the

Environmental Assessment and Review Process under which we are operating has been requested by DND. That is the way of the Government of Canada has established it.

As guarantees against the sorts of fears that I sense you have, we have, first of all, the Guidelines document. These Guidelines are expected to be followed by National Defence. Beyond that I do not think there is anything else to be said unless Major McCabe would agree to say something.

MAJOR McCABE: Sir, I understand your concern. On the surface it appears as an conflict of interest. The Department of National Defence is not in the business of preparing environmental assessments. We need someone else to do that for us. They will be required to follow the extremely detailed and demanding Guidelines.

The people that will answer these questions will be selected from the firm that has the experience to conduct these studies, and they will go out themselves and get the experts. They will go out into the field and talk to specialists like yourself. They will talk to the people who have knowledge about specific areas. That is where they gather their knowledge. We are obviously paying them, and one could assume, I suppose, that we could get into all sorts of situations there. We cannot do that. These people will be doing a thorough job which we cannot do ourselves. It is as a result of these public hearings where the Panel gets your suggestions and complaints, and are then in a position to determine what it is they have to have satisfactory answers to.

Believe me, there is no conflict of interest here. If we are asked to perform some specific kind of activity in relation to what the NATO centre wants to do, we cannot ignore that. When the assessment is completed, we will submit it to the Panel and to the public. We are not out to hide or distort information on this project. If it turns out that there are major problems, I would suggest that we are going to have to tell NATO that it is not possible to put the thing in there.

Maybe you are not convinced, but believe me, that is very much the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps just to add a final word on the subject, the proponent, National Defence, will make a contribution to the Environmental Impact Statement, its own statement of how it views this project. It will set forth how it intends, as far as it its own responsibility goes, to deal with these impacts. It is the statement of the proponent. The Panel will then judge that statement, using its own expertise, using the expertise of the technical experts we have engaged to support the Panel, and certainly using information we have received from groups such as yours, and other interested members of the public.

We will use this expertise to help us determine that what is being proposed is environmentally acceptable. After doing that, the Panel will make a report to the government.

I put it to you that a great many people feel that that sort of process has, in the past, demonstrated that it will work. The Impact Statement is not intended under this process to be a totally objective, detailed, disinterested document. If is, after all, a statement of the proponent.

Now I think all the scheduled speakers will be heard. I am sure their presentations will be worthwhile.

I think we will now proceed to hear the Makivik Corporation. I believe Mr. Peters is going to speak on its behalf. If he is ready, would he please come forward.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JOHNNY PETERS: I am making this presentation on behalf of the Makivik Corporation.

The militarization of the north began during World War II. Across the north, airports were built in order to move troops and war materials to the battlefields of northern Europe. In 1942, for example, the United States government constructed Kuujjuaq airport for use by the United States Air Force in the Crimson Route operation, a route for flights between California and northern Europe. Goose Bay is another example of an airport planned and

Peters, Sub.

and built by the United States government to be used by the military as a link between North America and northern Europe.

After the war, the north became even more militarized. When, as part of the NORAD plan, the United States and Canadian governments decided to build a defence system known as the DEW line and mid-Canada line, military bases and radar stations were build across the Arctic. Later, with the advent of use of nuclear energy, military bases were built to harbour nuclear submarines. Today,"one half of the Soviet nuclear submarine fleet is based at Murmansk, and Soviet S.L.B.M. submarines are now deployed in Soviet Arctic basin." (Independence and Internationalism, p. 135.) United States nuclear submarines are also found in these areas, thus making nuclear submarines in Arctic water a common place.

In the Northwest Territories, the McKenzie River is being used as a test site for the Cruise missile, and the DEW line is being modernized in a project called the North Warning System. Together they are bringing more aircraft and military personnel into the Arctic. Since 1980, whole regions of Labrador and Quebec have been used for low level flight training. And now, the entire NATO force is considering construction of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay, Labrador, and participating in these low level flights.

Peters, Sub.

This escalation of military activities in our northern region is, to say the least, frightening. Assuming that the NATO and Warsaw Pact are necessary, some of these military activities are also necessary. But for all intents and purposes, the militarization of the North comes into contradiction with the perception Canadians hold of their country, their belief that Canada is a peaceful nation.

Individually, not all military activities are disruptive to the environment and to the people of the North. However, when it comes to low level flying, and particularly to the TFWTC, there are grounds of serious concern over the impacts that these activities may have on both social and environmental factors. The combination of these activities could dangerously affect the fauna and the flora of the region and, as a consequence, jeopardize our hunting and fishing activities.

A case in point is the George River caribou herd. Any disruption of that herd would negatively affect not only the people of Kuujjuaq, but all the Inuit of northern Quebec. Every year we need approximately 5,000 caribou to feed our families and to furnish skins and other vital by-products. Caribou are also, through sport hunting, an essential part of the northern economic system. Caribou sport hunting and outfitting is a source of cash income for many Inuit in our communities.

Peters, Sub.

The caribou are only one of our main concerns. We are also very worried about the impacts that low level flying may have on migratory bird populations, fish, lakes, rivers, the land and the Inuit as a people. We have heard that the exhaust emission from these planes may be a direct cause of water and flora pollution. We have also heard from the Inuit using the George River that the noise level from these planes is extremely high. Native people have reported that the noise may burst children's eardrums, cause deafness and frighten children and adults alike away from their hunting grounds.

As a result, low level flights might very well affect Native people as individuals and as members of a society and culture. They are disruptive of our way of life. They threaten our present and our future. They endanger our culture and our society.

Our Native neighbours from Ntesinan are right when they say that these flights and other military exercises are conducted over and on their land without their permission. The Inuuts have aboriginal rights on their lands, which should be recognized and respected. We also have aboriginal rights and these too should be recognized and respected.

The military has never respected these

Peters, Sub.

rights. They have been using the land, the air and the sea for over 40 years without even acknowledging the presence of Native people and, even less, respecting their aboriginal rights. We were never informed of these activities until the planes were flying just above our heads. Our land has been used as if it were desolated and uninhabited. To paraphrase Justice Berger, the North is not a frontier, it is our homeland.

To protect our homeland, we have no alternative therefore than to be against such military activities as low level flying and the NATO project.

It took years of effort and a common front of many Native groups to finally obtain some information on the military activities on our land, and to have this Environmental Assessment Review Process set up. In spite of our position against such activities, we want to participate in this process. We have therefore reviewed and commented on the Draft Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec.

Our recent experience with environmental impact assessment has not been a good one. The construction or renovation of airstrips and airport facilities in our communities gave rise to a somewhat misleading and deceiving impact assessment

Peters, Sub.

process for the Inuit. In retrospect, what emerges from an examination of the process "is a very serious shortcoming between the stated objectives of the social and economic impact studies, the specific findings of these studies and the real application of findings after the review process. At the present time, much of what the community stated in terms of economic and social benefits or concerns has been totally ignored when planning and carrying out construction." (An Overview of Concerns of the Present State of Impact Assessment, p. 3).

One of the stated objectives of the Draft Guidelines is that "all groups and populations potentially affected by the project should be consulted to ascertain the value that they place upon the various components of the ecosystem." (Guidelines, p. 10).

Consultation is an essential part of any environmental impact assessment process, be it with the public or with professionals. In the proposed guidelines, however, the principle of consultation is not clearly defined. With no definition, the term consultation can assume any number of attributes, or none at all. Thus, we would like a better indication of what consultation means to the Panel, and how the members perceive the process.

Consultation must be organized if all the interested parties are to be provided with

8A-11

Peters, Sub.

opportunities to express their concerns, wishes and values. This can be a time-consuming operation at best, and the remoteness of the communities in the affected region could make it even more lengthy. Both the Native and non-Native populations in each community must be interviewed so that all interests and concerns may be expressed without prejudice. It is important that the process provide for continued community consultation so that needs are made known, and proper consideration be given to them in the planning and management of the project.

Consultation will be especially important when it comes to defining terms such as "values" and "significance". The Panel refers to both in the Guidelines and requests that they be defined in the EIS. Such concepts, however, can only be properly defined after a meaningful consultation with the affected population has gone on. Beanlands and Duinker (1983) refer to the use of social scoping versus ecological scoping as a means of prioritizing necessary studies. We can only emphasize the fact that such a social scoping exercise is of absolute necessity to the success of the assessment and its acceptance by the Native population.

To achieve this type of consultation, good coordination of all research activities is essential. Otherwise the seemingly endless succession of researchers, each doing his own

8A-12 Peters, Sub.

consultation in his own way, leads to a totally erratic process with no links or relations between the steps. Without proper coordination the end result is confusion, not consultation.

We would also like to see the communities involved in the research aspects of the EIA. The Inuit of the region are the ideal source for studies on wildlife or environmental phenoma. A good example of their knowledge has emerged from the Inuit Land Use Study of Northern Quebec being carried out by the Makivik Research Department. The data were collected in a long series of interviews that allowed Inuit hunters to express their perception of the ecology and environment of the region in which they live and hunt. This information is very detailed, and provides evidence of historic and present Inuit land use over all of Quebec and Labrador. Thus, the intergration of Inuit knowlege could be critical to the success of any proposed studies.

For example, the historic information could aid the proponent considerably in describing the "existing environmental conditions" (Guidelines, p. 9), if the Panel is referring to conditions prior to the existence of an air base in Goose Bay. This would be an appropriate starting point for the EIS, as it would provide a picture of the natural and human environment before introduction of air base activities.

8A-13

Peters, Sub.

Monitoring is another very important component in environmental impact assessment. There has been much criticism in the literature that monitoring has not received adequate attention in the EIA process. Indeed, in the proposed Guidelines, the term monitoring is never defined, nor is its implementation explained. We are concerned that this lack of definition may lead to a poorly conducted monitoring process in the current assessment and its subsequent review.

Monitoring tends to be viewed in terms of studies to test the success of impact predictions and proposed mitigative measures. However, monitoring can be viewed in the much larger perspective of watching over the whole impact assessment and the subsequent implementation and operation of the project. In this sense, monitoring is a type of watch dog activity which ensures that all aspects of the EIA process are implemented as proposed and continue to be so over the life of the project.

We would like to see a watch dog committee formed whose role would be in the broader sense of monitoring. Such a committee would have to be involved from the early stages of the process so that it could observe the conduct of all studies prior to presentation of the EIS. The committee would then take on the role of enforcing all mitigative measures and supervising the prescribed monitoring

Peters, Sub.

studies. This role would continue, along with further monitoring studies, for the life of the project so that any unexpected or residual impacts that might occur can be detected and the operation of the air base can be monitored to make certain that it conforms with the plans described in the EIS.

We are also concerned about what might happen to the EIA if NATO were to lost interest in the Labrador airbase. Will a more appropriate time frame be considered, or will all studies be terminated at that instant, since they may well be deemed unnecessary. It is our opinion that now that EARP has been initiated, it should be carried out to its conclusion even if NATO decides to go elsewhere.

On this same line of thought, it was noted that the possibility of a "no go" scenario, and its related impacts, was not given much consideration in the Guidelines. Such a scenario is as important, if not more so, than any of the others proposed and thus should be given greater consideration both in the Buidelines and in the studies conducted. Once again, such a scenario is closely linked with our concern for what would happen with the EIA should NATO drop its plans for the training centre.

The Panel divided the project into two components in the proposed Guidelines, one considering the possible new training centre at Goose Bay, and one which considers a continuation of the current training

Peters, Sub.

program. While we believe the breakdown of the assessment into the two separate parts is a good strategy, there is some concern that the two components are not that dissimilar. If the low level flight training is expected to increase in the coming years, then it could well approach the same level as if the new NATO Training Centre were built. We feel that a greater description of what Component 1 (Guidelines, p. 7) will comprise of in the coming years is a necessity. We also believe that the Panel should have the mandate to stop all ongoing military activities and that it should consider making a decision on how much of an increase in training activities at the present base should be allowed, if any.

One of our final concerns with the proposed Guidelines is the consideration of cumulative impacts or interactions that the project may have on the region. Nowhere is the region clearly defined. Obviously, a number of projects will arise in the immediate vicinity of Goose Bay if the NATO Training Centre is built. In addition, other projects might develop in regions further north as a direct result of a new training centre at Goose Bay. It is these projects that we feel should receive greater attention in the current assessment so that a more regional planning perspective can be envisaged. If such future projects are anticipated, the broader

Peters, Sub.

region will be able to produce plans and/or alternatives for the management of these proposals, thus limiting the impacts that such projects might have on the population and environment.

As a final comment, we would like to add that the speed at which EARP has been initiated and is expected to carry out the assessment resembled the shot-gun approach that EIA in Canada has become known for. Much criticism has been expressed in the literature about unrealistic deadlines for good scientific studies. In the south, such an approach may work because of the large data base available on many different subjects. The North, however, does not have such a store of information, and time is required to develop the scientific knowledge needed for the decision-making process. Is this assessment, and its one year time frame, another case of the shot-gun approach? How can an adequate data base be produced for such a large project in one year and responsible decisions made from this base? After all, "the ultimate purpose of an assessment study is to influence decision" (Beanlands and Duinker, 1983: 67), and if poor studies are carried out, poor decisions will result.

To recapitulate our main concerns with the proposed Guidelines and recommendations, (1) we would like studies to be conducted on the impact of low level flying on (a) the lifecycle and migration

Peters, Sub.

of the George River caribou herd and caribou in the affected area; (b) the disruption of migratory bird routes and possible nesting and hatching grounds; and (c) the possible disruption of fish migration and spawning beds. (2) We would like studies to be carried out on the impact of exhaust emission on water and flora pollution in order to determine the extent of contamination that may occur and any resultant impacts. (3) We would like careful studies done in the amount of noise the low level planes will create and the possible impacts this may have on our families and children, and on the wildlife we hunt. (4) We would like to see consultation and the consultation process more clearly defined in the Guidelines so that it will be both adequately and correctly conducted. (5) We would like a social scoping exercise, as described in Beanlands and Duinker (1983), to be used to aid in the definition of the terms "value" and "significance".

(6) We would like to see involvement of the communities in as many research aspects of the EIA as possible so as to ensure Inuit input into the process. (7) We would like the term "monitoring" to be better defined in the Guidelines and its proposed implementation explained.

(8) We recommend the creation of a watch dog committee whose role would be to provide surveillance and enforcement of all monitoring studies

Peters, Sub.

and mitigative measures if the project is implemented. (9) We would like the Guidelines to give greater attention to the consideration of a "no go" scenario in the Environmental Impact Statement. (10) We would like a more detailed description of Component 1 of the project so that a better distinction between the two components can be made. (11) We feel a definition of "the region" should be included in the Guidelines to clarify the "regional impacts" that will be considered in the EIS.

(12) We would like to have the assurance of the Panel that, if NATO were to drop Labrador airbase project, the EIA would continue on a more appropriate time frame and decisions made as to how much flying should be permitted at the airbase. And, (13) we feel that the Panel should have the mandate to stop all ongoing military activities in Labrador and Quebec.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Peters. I am sure we are all agreed with your last request.

I wonder if anyone on the Panel would like to ask a question about your presentation? No, I see not.

Now, we are getting on through the afternoon. I have five other names on my list of scheduled speakers.

I wonder if the students would mind

waiting a little longer and going on tonight instead of this afternoon? I see their heads nodding. Thank you very much.

Then if there is no objection, I would ask Miss Daisy Watt of Avataq Cultural Institute to come forward and speak to us next.

---SUBMISSION BY MISS DAISY WATT: Thank you very much for allowing me to sit here, and for seeing you as well.

First of all, the Avataq Cultural Institute has a committee of elders, and Avataq annually holds the Elders' Conference, and that conference is attended by various groups, by Makivik Corporation, KRG and other Inuit organizations.

These conferences are to get guidance from the elders, and to get more information of their history, and to give direction for the future.

Since our President lives in another community, I am the only one that is present here, and I have been asked to give a presentation on behalf of our President.

Since you have come here to inform us, I thank you very much. In the past, in 1949, we were not being informed, and we did not have any means of communicating with other groups. During the war we were very much astonished when two big planes came in. The people were in confusion for a while; a lot of people were crying because they thought they had come to kill us. There were two American airplanes, Watt, Sub.

black airplanes -- I was a young person then, my parents were adults then; they just went outside and started praying. We did not have any means of being informed of a war going on, so it was a big surprise to us.

But now that you have come here and informed us as to what is going on, we appreciate it. Nowadays we can hear what is going on in the world through the radio and television. We get daily news, so we are aware of what is going on around us. But I cannot forget the time when two big airplanes came and landed on the water, with floats. We were wondering what they were, because we did not know what they were. We were scared; there were a lot of people crying and praying. There were people that were out hunting, and when they saw the planes they started running around and trying to hide behind rocks. But, in fact, those planes were looking for a place to build an air strip. Since they were here to defend our country, that was okay. So they came here to build an air strip, and we have an air strip that was built then.

We were lucky because we had an interpreter, an Inuk,or someone who was able to speak Inuktituk and English, and they were able to inform us about what was going on.

Personally I think they want to use this air strip again since it was built by the

Watt, Sub.

United States military. That is what I think, and if you wish to answer me, please do so.

The lifestyle nowadays is different from then. Nowadays we can talk to each other, and have discussions regarding the land and the wildlife, our food supply. We can discuss such things as jobs, and planning for the future in the Inuit land.

As we all have televisions now, we can see through television in Labrador what is going on. Sometimes we see on television that the Indians are out hunting, and they run to the trees for protection. We hear that low flying aircraft are scaring these people, and a lot of pregnant women have premature babies. We have means of communicating so we hear of these things.

This airstrip is just a few feet from our home. We have children, and there will be more children in the future, maybe even after I have gone because when the time comes I will have to go. Maybe after I have gone I hope that our children will be cautious of what is going on.

We are not against the white people that come here, since they have helped us a lot in the past. I know that we have to care for each other, and I am glad that there are such people that do studies, and I will inform the other people in Avataq, and the elders, of what went on at this meeting. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Madam.

I believe it is now time to hear the presentation from the Kativik Regional Government. I believe Mr. Kleist will speak to us. Are you ready, sir?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. TIKILE KLEIST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Tikile Kleist. I am the Regional Councillor for Kuujjuaq, and a member of the Executive Council of the Kativik Regional Government.

I would like to begin by extending my appreciation to the Panel and its staff for taking the time and effort to come to Kuujjuaq to consult the public on the guidelines pertaining to low level military flying activities over Labrador and Northern Quebec. I understand that you will be going to Kangiqsualujjuaq tomorrow to consult the public there also.

Before entering into a discussion of the Regional Government's point of view with respect to the project under review, I would like to inform the Panel of what KRG is and what its mandate is.

In 1978, as provided for in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, the Kativik Regional Government was incorporated under the Act Respecting Northern Villages and the Kativik Regional Government. In the ensuing years, 12 of the communities north of the 55th parallel in Quebec were incorporated

Kleist, Sub.

as municipalities. These northern village corporations are responsible for municipal services, and their councils are also responsible for the administration of the local housing corporation, the community Inuit hunting, fishing and trapping support program and other programs.

The Kativik Regional Government is a supramunicipal administration for the region north of the 55th parallel in Quebec. It provides technical and administrative support to the northern village corporations, sets regional priorities, administers specific programs and acts as a municipality for all the lands outside the municipalities.

Each municipal corporation is represented on the council of the regional government by an elected regional councillor. The KRG councillors are also the councillors for the Kativik Regional Board of Health and Social Services. KRG's executive also acts as the executive council of the Kativik Regional Development Council. This last organization coordinates economic and social development in our region which we call the Kativik Region.

One of the major departments within the Kativik Regional Government is the Environment and Resource Management Department. In addition to its environmental program, this department administers the Inuit Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Support Program established pursuant to Section 29 of the JBNQA.

Kleist, Sub.

Within our environment program, KRG pays a major role in the coordination of Section 23 of the JBNQA entitled Environment and Future Development North of the 55th Parallel. In accordance with this section, KRG participates in the decision-making processes of the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedures for our Region. KRG, in fact, appoints members to several environmental committees such as the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee and the Kativik Environmental and Social Impact Review Panel. These last two bodies fulfill mandates that are very similar to the mandates your Panel has for projects planned in our Region. The Secretariats of these bodies have their head offices at KRG,and it provides them with administrative services.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, the protection of the environment and social milieu in our Region is a major priority for KRG, and I think it is a priority for all Northern Quebec Inuit.

Low flying military activities over the Kativik Region, the review process: I would like to state from the very beginning that the Kativik Regional Government is concerned about the potential impact of the proposed increase in low level flights, and the possible establishment of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay.

These concerns were first transmitted by KRG to the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee

Kleist, Sub.

in 1984. At that time, KRG questioned why a project with such potential impacts was not submitted to the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Review Procedures pursuant to Section 23 of the JBNQA since it was taking place, in part, over the Kativik Region. This question has remained unanswered.

Fortunately, through pressure exercised on the federal government by Inuit and other Native groups, your Panel was finally established to assess these potential impacts. As you may know, in order to avoid a duplication of review processes, the Environmental Assessment Review Panel and the JBNQA, Section 23 process, KRG negotiated a memorandum of understanding with the federal administrator responsible for Chapter 23 of the JBNQA and the federal Minister of the Environment. Our principle concern during these negotiations was that one review process be established which would respect the rights and guarantees of the Inuit as established in Sections 23 and 24 of the JBNQA. The memorandum of understanding which was eventually signed, in July 1986, incorporated these rights.

KRG believes that while the memorandum of understanding incorporates the principles of Section 23 in the process, it generally served to strengthen the process, not only for northern Quebec Inuit, but for all affected Native groups. We sincerely hope that consideration of the principles

Kleist, Sub.

of Section 23 of the JBNQA by the Panel will not be limited to the Kativik Region, but will be extended over the whole territory affected by the project.

Although the KRG is hopeful that the present EARP process will serve to consider and minimize the negative environmental and social impacts of military flying activities, and the possible establishment of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, we have major concerns with respect to the mandate of the Panel.

First, we have notice in the Guidelines that the Panel does not have the mandate to recommend that low level flights be reduced or stopped altogether. Presumably, the reasons are due to the fact that Canada has already committed itself to the undertaking of such flights by the NATO armed forces. This, in our view, is an unjustified explanation. Had an appropriate review process been established before the occurrence of these flights and before firm commitments were made, the Panel's mandate would surely have been broader. Clearly a mistake was made in not reviewing the impacts of these flights in the early planning stages of the project. Yet, because of this mistake, the present review process can only assist the proponent in minimizing the impacts of present and future flights. KRG recommends that the Panel request from the Minister of the Environment a broader mandate to review the low level flights component of

Kleist, Sub.

the project. This mandate should be broad enough to recommend, if necessary, a stop to any future expansion of flights and a reduction in present flights. The Panel should also have the mandate to recommend alternative project areas or modifications to the present project boundaries.

Second, we are concerned that NATO is expected to render its decision on the location of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in late 1986, before the Panel has completed the review process. Once this decision is taken, and assuming that Goose Bay is chosen, KRG is concerned that political pressure to go ahead with the project could diminish the government's ability to accept and implement the Panel's recommendations. In this respect, KRG recommends that the Panel ask the government to withhold any firm commitments on the establishment of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre to the NATO allies until the review process is complete.

KRG's concerns about the project: Since the first reports from persons who have witnessed low flying military aircraft, and the subsequent reports from Goose Bay, we have had serious reservations about the actual environmental and social impacts.

Specifically, our concerns have centered on the possible effects on regional wildlife, subsistence harvesting, tourism, people's transportation and the people's quality of life.

Kleist, Sub.

The George River caribou herd is estimated at 700,000 animals. It is currently the largest free ranging caribou herd in the world. . There is no doubt that aircraft will fly over large concentrations of caribou during the exercises. Should these flights occur over groups of pregnant females or after calving, one can only assume it would lead to increased mortality. However, even with mature caribou no one can accurately predict the results. One this is certain: The result will not be positive.

The caribou are harvested in the Kativik by the Inuit of Kangiqsualujjuaq, Kuujjuaq and Tasiujaq and, to a lesser extent, by the ten other Inuit communities. In addition, they are harvested in the region by the Naskapi and the Cree.

The caribou are also a mainstay for the tourist outfitting camps. The caribou hunters who arrive each fall in Schefferville and Kuujjuaq inject hundreds of thousands of dollars into the regional economy. A decline in this herd would have very adverse effects on the economy and culture of all communities in this region.

It is hoped that there will be sufficient time and resources made available so that in the depth studies can be conducted on the effects of these flights on the caribou.

Consideration should also be given to

Kleist, Sub.

other species, such as migratory birds, foxes, wolves and fish, which may also be affected by the low flying aircraft.

In the Kativik Region there is no mining or manufacturing. Besides the government and service industries, subsistence harvesting is not only a part of the culture, but also part of life and the economy. The hunters, fishermen and trappers must travel far from permanent communities to follow the migratory species. Although the flight lines of the military aircraft are far from the permanent communities, the hunters and their preys will be affected.

If the experience of other groups in Labrador and on the North Shore of Quebec is repeated here, then the low level flights will cause severe disruptions on harvesting activities. We do not want these activities disrupted. They are too important to our lives.

Along the George River are some of the best salmon fishing and caribou hunting camps in Quebec. Tourists come from all over North America to these outfitters. Over the years, they have built their reputation on their facilities, services, wilderness locations, excellent salmon and char fishing, and caribou hunting. The revenue from these businesses is very important to the economy of Kangiqsualujjuaq and Kuujjuaq in our region, as

Kleist, Sub.

well as Schefferville to the south. They provide a large number of seasonal jobs for our population.

The clients of the outfitting camps are mostly from large urban areas. They come expecting wilderness. For this they must pay the high cost of transportation. It is a very competitive market for these tourists. Much depends on word of mouth advertising and the region's or camp's reputation.

Even after only two or three instances of flights over a camp during one season, the outfitting operations would suffer. No matter how good the hunting and fishing is, it could not minimize the shock of suddenly being assaulted by supersonic noise in what appeared to be an isolated setting.

Eventually, when the word got out, it would be very difficult to attract tourists to any camp in the region.

Much of the transportation to these camps and in this region is by STOL aircraft or by float plane. These aircraft do not normally fly regular flight lines. They may operate from remote landing strips or from lakes. They often do not possess more than basic communication equipment. Unless there is a restriction on flying in the military areas, there appears to be a serious potential for accidents.

The low level training flights are only a part of the increasing military activities in this region. Apparently the airport at Kuujjuaq is

Kleist, Sub.

being considered as a refuelling base for Canadian F-18's as part of the NORAD commitment. In addition, there are plans for support services to the new radar bases that will be part of upgrading the DEW line. Concerns about this increasing activity have been voiced by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, and it should be considered in assessing the effects of this probject.

In closing, the James Bay Hydro Electric Project included the diversion of part of the Caniapiscau River south, away from Ungava Bay into James Bay. Hydro Quebec, to maximize hydro electric production, decided to make a river run backwards. They then assured us that the environmental repercussions would be minimal.

We have seen and lived with the changes in the fish stocks in the Kuujjuaq River, the radical changes in the ice formations, the difficulties navigating the river, and the drowning of thousands of caribou. It is impossible to undertake such large-scale projects without serious impact on the environment.

Now we have military people sending the most modern fighter aircraft to fly at hundreds of miles an hour, as low as 50 meters, across our land. We know that they will produce numerous documents all of which will indicate that the environmental impact will be minimal.

Kleise, Sub.

We intend to follow the work of the Panel and the studies that will be prepared very closely.

We ask that the Panel take our concerns into consideration when finalizing the Guidelines.

On behalf of the Council of the Kativik Regional Government, I would like to thank the members of the Panel for the opportunity to make this presentation. I look forward to meeting with you in the future. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. We appreciate receiving your comments, and we certainly will take them into consideration.

We still have some time available before our scheduled time to adjourn for dinner. I wonder if the students would to come forward now and make their presentation?

---SUBMISSION BY JOCELYN BARRETT, LOUISA WHITELEY AND MICHAEL GORDON:

MICHAEL GORDON: First, on behalf of the students of Jaanimmarik School in Kuujjuaq, I would like to thank you for giving us a chance to make our views known on this issue.

We, the students of Kuujjuaq, are against low level flying military activities in or around Kuujjuaq.

We feel that low level flying military aircraft would disturb the environment in the vicinity of Kuujjuaq. The migratory patterns of wild fowl and

Gordon, Sub.

caribou which are the main sources of food in Kuujjuaq could be disrupted.

We also fear local game, such as wolf, fox and ptarmigan, could be scared away from the area surrounding our village, thus disrupting the Inuit culture.

We feel that no one has the right to jeopardize the Inuit culture in that way.

We also feel that offensive military training exercises could increase the possibility of world war. Is it worth the risk?

That is all I have to say. I hope this brief presentation got our point across.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Your point certainly is taken, and well noted. I commend you for coming forward and making the presentation. It indicates that you are good and responsible citizens of your community.

We have two other speakers scheduled, but it is getting rather close to dinner time. I think it best to adjourn the meeting at this time, and to come back at about 7:00 o'clock this evening, at which time we have two other speakers scheduled.

In the meantime, if anyone else feels that he or she would like to come up and speak to the Panel in front of the meeting tonight, would you please see Mr. Jim Clarke. Mr. Clarke, would you please stand up. Please go and see Mr. Clarke, and give him your name and the name of the organization you represent, if that is the case. We will certainly do our best to give you an opportunity to speak at tonight's session.

Thank you very much, and we will see you again at 7:00 o'clock.

---Dinner adjournment.

---Upon resuming at 7:35 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN; Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I believe we have some people here tonight who were not here earlier in the day. For that reason, we will repreat a little of what we said at the beginning of the meeting this morning.

My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of certain existing and proposed military flying activities over parts of Quebec and Labrador.

We have come to Kuujjuaq to speak to you about the probject, and to listen to whatever you might like to say to the Panel about it.

To begin, I would like to introduce the other members of the Panel. At the end of the table, to your left, is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. He was, at one time, stationed at Goose Bay.

His last position was as a Deputy Commander of one of the regions of NORAD.

Next to Mr. Stewart is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who is experienced in the subject of wildlife, particularly in Newfoundland and Labrador. He lives in St. John's and is Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consultant firm.

To my left is Mr. Tim McNeill, who lives in Makkovik, Labrador, where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill is very knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, where he has been active in Montangnais Indian Band affairs, and has also been involved in certain commercial enterprises in that community.

Finally, at the other end of the table, is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec, and has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapi. Dr. Wilkinson was nominated to be a member of this Panel by the Kativik Regional Government.

I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, an agency of the Government of Canada, located in Ottawa, where I am the Director for the Atlantic Region of that office.

The Panel understands that very little was known about this project before we came here today. So, I am going to introduce a gentleman whom we have invited here as a representative of the Department of National Defence, which we are calling the proponent of this project. He will give a brief presentation about the nature of the project, and he will also be willing to answer questions about it. I would like now to introduce Major David McCabe.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of Kuujjuaq, good evening.

For those of you who were with us earlier today and heard my presentation this morning, I ask your patience. I am going to try and shorten it a little bit, hopefully not omitting any of the important parts.

I am the Project Officer, in Ottawa at National Defence Headquarters, for Military Developments at Goose Bay, specifically the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, as it is called, which I will talk about a little later.

My purpose here this evening is to provide some information on two proposals that are being studied over the next 18 months or so that are going through the environmental assessment process that the Chairman has referred to. I will try and give details about these: One, as I mentioned earlier, is the NATO project, and the other proposal is an expansion of the current operations at Goose Bay.

Goose Bay was built at a military airport in 1941, and has seen a military presence ever since that time at different levels of activity. In its peak years about 12,000 military personnel and their families lived at Goose Bay.

After some years of relatively little activity, there was an increase in flying activity at Goose Bay, starting in about 1980. At that time, the British Air Force, the Royal Air Force, was conducting a small amount of low level flying training, and the German Air Force, at that time, expressed an interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. Because of this proposed increase of flying, and also because of the request to establish a practice target range, the Department of National Defence conducted what is called an Initial Environmental Evaluation. This kind of evaluation was done, in this case, as a desk study; that is, existing data from different parts of the country, different parts of the world, and experts were consulted on the possible effect that this kind of flying might have on the environment and on the socio-economic aspects of the local region. It was not a study done by specialists, or done in the area over a long period of time.

However, some basic conclusions were drawn from the evaluation. It was decided that the kind of activity that was proposed really offered no effects. In fact it appeared that the effects on the environment, particularly, would be negligible.

One area where the data were inconclusive, was the possible effects of these kinds of aircraft, jets or high performance aircraft, on caribou. Several studies have been done in various parts of the world on the effects of light aircraft, the small aircraft, and helicopters on caribou, but not jets.

Because of this lack of information, it was recommended that a policy of avoidance of the caribou be established.

The current activity in Goose Bay involves air forces of four nations. The United States Air Force has a very small detachment of personnel whose primary role is to service transient transport aircraft -- the very large cargo planes that come through on their way to and from Europe. The Canadian Forces' primary role at present is to operate and maintain the long range radar facility which is part of the old CADIN Pine Tree early warning system. As well, the Canadian Forces operate the air traffic control radar facility, and also, since 1984, mans the Military Coordination Centre. As of March of this year, the Canadian Forces established a permanent station rescue flight, consisting of three rescue helicopters which are based in Goose Bay year 'round. The Military Coordination Centre that I mentioned was established to provide safe and efficient control of the local military flying. Indeed, all local military flights are recorded and registered at the Coordination Centre with a detailed flight plan showing the route of the intended flight. On a daily basis, the Coordination Centre advises the air crew of any local restrictions which might exist, such as concentrations of caribou, any known occupied fishing or hunting camps, and these are marked on the pilots' maps as areas to be avoided. The camps, for example, have a small circle about five miles in diameter placed over the location as an area to be avoided by the low flying aircraft.

The flying activity in the low level takes place primarily in two areas: A northern and a southern training area, and those are marked on the map behind me. The northern training area has been subdivided so that it can be closed off as required when things like the caribou calving period is active, or the migration period, when there are large herds moving through a particular area; that is, closed off until the animals move through -- that is, it is closed off to military flying, it is not closed off to any other kinds of flying.

I mentioned the proposal to expand the current activity as being one of the proposals to be considered. What we mean by an expansion is, at present the current users have a certain number of aircraft that they are using, and they are conducting a certain level of training activity during the flying season which is usually about the beginning of March to about the end of October.

These countries have indicated a desire to increase somewhat the number of aircraft over the next several years, and also to increase the level of activity somewhat. Their activity, their training will still be primarily low level flying. They will be doing some night flying, and some bad weather flying. These two types of training are specifically to train air crew who fly the Tornado aircraft, which is equipped with special equipment that enables the plane to fly at a certain altitude over the ground automatically. And it takes training to be able to use this.

The expansion would also include another practice target range. We have one in existence right now that is located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This practice target range is about eight miles, or 13 kilometers, in diameter, and is located in an open, sandy area which has, at some time in the past, been burned out.

The aircraft only use practice weapons on this range; that is, non-explosive, non-contaminant devices.

There is a study going on right now to try and locate or identify a suitable area in the northern training area for another one of these practice ranges. These areas, incidentally, are not about 200 flights or sorties a day for 20 two-week periods a year. In other words, about 40 weeks of the year would be used for active training.

The numbers of people involved in this would be about 370 air crew, and about 1,300 ground personnel coming into Goose Bay every two weeks for training for a two week period. These people and their training would be supported by a permanent base staff of about 1,700 people. These people would come from a variety of nations. Because these people would be living in Goose Bay for two or three years at a time, it is expected that a number of them would bring their families. That might further increase the population by another 1,000 to 1,500 people.

This facility, if it is put in in its full scope, would require considerable expansion of facilities such as hangars, aircraft maintenance shops, barracks, housing for the married people, recreational facilities, possibly a parallel runway, expansion or rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system that exists in Goose Bay, and would also require the construction or establishment of stores to provide groceries and clothing and things like that.

The phasing of this proposal is such that the working group I mentioned has examined the two sites. They have written up reports on their findings and they have made a recommendation that is currently going through various level of review in NATO. This recommendation is expected to reach the top level, the decision level, by December of this year. At that time it is expected that a decision or a recommendation for the most suitable site will be made. If that decision is made at that time, NATO then goes to the host country and begins a two-year period of negotiations, design and planning of the centre. As well, during this period, funding sources would have to be identified, because at present there is no money specifically identified for the construction of the centre.

During that two-year period, if some kind of major obstacle is encountered in the negotiations or planning, then NATO has the option to revert or turn to the other alternate site. It would begin the planning and negotiation all over again.

Under the current schedule, it is anticipated that the NATO centre would be operational in the early 1990's; that is, barring any major delays that may be encountered.

From a socio-economic aspect, there are two main phases involved with this project which would have an effect on employment, for example. The first is during the construction phase, and the second is the on-going day to day operational phase. The Department of National Defence is just completing a socio-economic study of potential employment opportunities, et cetera, potential revenues that might be realized. This study has examined both an increase of the current operation, and also has examined the NATO centre.

What I want to emphasize here is that, with reference to the NATO centre, they are looking at employment opportunities, et cetera, which might accrue from the full scale project being built. Because of that, the figures are really highly speculative. If any down-sizing of the project should occur due to economic constraints or other factors, then obviously the socio-economic aspect would also proportionately be reduced.

I think is all I want to say just now. I know I have probably missed a few things that I mentioned this morning, and if people who were here earlier wish to bring these to my attention, that is fine. I want to keep it short to provide the maximum amount of time for questions, specifically to me, and also for presentations that I believe are to be made to the Panel.

I think you very much for your attention. Mr. Chairmen, I would certainly be glad to answer any questions that might be posed to me at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. If anyone has a question that he or she would like to ask, I would ask you to come to one of the two microphones standing on the floor, and to state your name clearly for our records before you begin to speak.

If you were not here earlier today, and

you think someone else may have asked the same question earlier, that does not matter. Go ahead and ask your question anyway. The important thing is that everyone who is here tonight should understand clearly what the project is. So please do not hesitate to ask any question you would like to ask, and Major McCabe will do his best it, I am sure.

Do we have any questions?

If there are no question, thank you again, Major.

We have two speakers scheduled for this evening. If there is time left after those presentations have been made, then we can once again invite questions about the project, or whatever.

Before we go to those two speakers, I will very briefly go over some of what I said this morning.

The reason this review is taking place is that the Government of Canada has established a process called the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, which is designed to assist the government in its process of planning for resource development or resource use projects for which it is in some way responsible.

Under that process, the Minister of the Environment appoints a group of knowledgeable people, and that is called a Panel. The Minister gives the panel certain instructions and directs it to conduct a review of the project that has been proposed. At the end of that review, it is directed to make a report both to the Minister of the Environment and to the minister of whichever department of the government that is responsible for the project.

The Panel carries out its duty by requesting the department responsible for the project, which we are calling the proponent, to prepare a report. That report is called an Environmental Impact Statement. In that statement, the proponent department makes a proposal to undertake its project in such a way that any benefits which may come as side effects from that project will be enhanced, will be increased, and, on the other hand, any undesirable environmental impacts, undesirable effect, will be kept to a minimum.

The panel then examines that environmental impact statement and, using whatever other information it may have available to it, reaches a conclusion whether or not the project being proposed as acceptable in terms of its consequences for the environment.

In this particular case, the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment in February of 1986 describing the project in much the same way as you just heard it described by Major McCabe, and asked the Minister to begin a public environmental review.

The Minister did, indeed, appoint a panel, the Panel you see before you tonight, in July of this year. The first thing the Panel has to do is to give some instructions to the Department of National Defence on how the Panel expects that department to carry out environmental studies, and to write the Environmental Impact Statement.

In order to make sure that the instructions given to National Defence contain all the right questions and cover all the right subject-matter, the Panel has published a document which is called Draft Guidelines. Draft, because it is exactly that. It is a preliminary version of the document. We are giving the public an opportunity to examine that document and to tell us whether it is complete; whether it covers all of the correct subject-material and in the correct manner.

During the month of October, the Panel is travelling to 17 communities, holding meetings, talking about the project, and, in particular, talking about this Draft Guidelines document. We are inviting anyone who is interested to tell us how they feel about that draft document.

When the meetings are over, the Panel will meet in Ottawa. It will look at all of the information coming from these meetings, and it will decide if any of the parts of the Draft Guidelines document needs to be improved.

Following that, the Guidelines, in their final form, will be presented to the Department of National Defence which will then begin the process of gathering together all of the information that is needed to produce the Environmental Impact Statement.

We expect that National Defence may be ready to deliver that Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel some time in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

The Impact Statement will immediately be distributed to the public so that the public will be able to examine it at the same as the Panel will be examining it. And a period of time of several months will be allowed for that process of examination of the Impact Statement.

When the Panel is sure that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is, it has met all the requirements set out in the Guidelines document, the Panel will announce some public hearings to be held in all of the important locations to discuss the project, and to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement.

When the public hearings are over, the Panel will then prepare its own report, a report based on its examination of the Impact Statement, and based on its conclusions after it has heard from the public, from other departments of government, and from any other interested groups.

That report of the Panel will discuss the project, it will discuss the expected environmental impacts and will discuss ways and means of dealing with those impacts. It will then make recommendations to the government on whether this project that is under review is environmentally acceptable.

The Panel expects to be able to deliver that report to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence some time late in 1987, or early in 1988.

I should mention also that the Panel does not have any power to commit this project to go ahead, or to refuse to allow it to go ahead. Decisions of that sort are always in the hands of the government which the people elect to make that sort of decision. In this case, the major responsibility would be in the hands of the Minister of National Defence.

I wonder if anyone has any questions about this process that they would like to ask at this time?

If not then, I think we should proceed to hear our scheduled speakers for this evening.

I will call first upon the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee. I believe Mr. Pierre Marchand is going to be the spokesman.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. PIERRE MARCHAND, MR. TOMMY GREY AND DR. JACQUES GIGUÈRE:

MR. PIERRE MARCHAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Panel, my name is Pierre Marchand. I am the Chairman of the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee.

Marchand, Sub.

First, I would like to introduce two other members of the Committee who will be available to answer questions after our presentation.

To my left is Mr. Tommy Grey, and to my right is Dr. Jacques Giguère, our Vice-Chairman.

The Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee, or KEAC, is pleased to have the opportunit to participate in the first series of public hearings held by the Environmental Assessment Review Panel on military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec. The KEAC's primary interest in the proposed increase of low altitude military flying activities and the possible establishment of an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in Goose Bay, Labrador for training NATO air forces is to ensure that the environment and social impacts of the project on the Kativik Region, the territory of Quebec north of the 55th parallel, are considered in accordance with the particular environmental and social protection regime applicable to the region. In fact, one of the principal mandates of the KEAC, our committee, as stated in Section 23.5.27 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, is to examine and make recommendations respecting the environmental and social impact assessment and review mechanisms and procedures for the region.

The KEAC is composed of nine members appointed in equal numbers by the Kativik Regional Government, Quebec and Canada. As its name implies,

Marchand, Sub.

it is a consultative body and the preferential and official forum for these governments in the Region concerning their involvement in the formulation of laws and regulations relating to the environmental and social protection regime. As such, it oversees the administration and management of the regime through the free exchange of respective views, concerns and information.

Section 23 of the agreement, entitled "Environment and Future Development North of the 55th Parallel", establishes a specific and unique environmental and social protection regime for the Kativik Region. Its guiding principle is development in harmony with the protection of the environment, a major preoccupation of the Inuit who inhabit the region.

An important feature of this regime is the establishment of environmental and social impact assessment and review procedures designed to minimize the negative environmental and social impacts of development on the Native people, and the wildlife resources of the Region. These procedures are divided into two components, namely (1) a provincial environmental and social impact assessment and review mechanism, and (2) a similar federal mechanism.

The decision to use either mechanism depends on whether the proposed project is subject to federal or provincial jurisdiction. For example, in the case of the military flying activities presently

Marchand, Sub.

under review by the Panel, this project, or at least its components which have an impact on the Kativik Region, would normally fall under the federal process according to the terms and conditions established in Section 23.4 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

Although similar in many respects, the review process established by Section 23 is unique in that its structures and mechanisms reflect the northern Quebec reality, and directly involves its people. For example, the review panel outlined in Section 23.4 is composed of five members, two of which are Native people or their duly authorized representatives appointed by the Regional Government.

Furthermore, the process is guided by a series of principles which include: the protection of Native people, societies, communities and economies with respect to developmental activity affecting the Region; the protection of the hunting, fishing and trapping rights of Native people in the Region, and their other rights therein with respect to developmental activity affecting the Region.

The last principle described above is unique in that it calls for the protection of the special rights and guarantees of the Native people established by and in accordance with Section 24 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. The cornerstones of these rights are: first, the right to harvest, which in many cases is exclusive to the

Native population and, second, the principle of priority of Native harvesting which means that the Native people are guaranteed levels of harvesting equal to the levels of harvesting present at the time of the signing of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

Section 23, Schedule 3 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, outlines in general terms the contents of an environmental and social impact statement to be prepared by the proponent of a northern development project. The schedule is unique in its emphasis on the consideration of the impacts on Native people and wildlife resources of the Region.

The KEAC, our committee, through its experience in overseeing the implementation of the impact assessment and review process for the Region, notes that the Inuit have held and continue to hold high expectations in the environmental protection regime. They view the regime as the principle means of controlling development in the region, and ensuring that the impacts on their environmental and social milieu are not unreasonable. Because of the importance the Inuit give to the regime, they are naturally hesitant to accept a process different from the one outlined in Section 23 without the firm assurance that their rights will be fully maintained.

As previously stated, the principal

concern of the KEAC with respect to military flying activities over Labrador and northern Quebec, is that the project respect the environment protection regime established by the agreement.

The 1984, the KEAC became aware of the flights occuring over the Kativik Region. It noted at that time that the original project had not been submitted to the James Bay and Northern Quebec Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Review Procedure. Furthermore, it also noted that the only review of this project's impacts consisted of an initial environmental evaluation produced by the proponent in 1981 and submitted to the Government of Newfoundland. Following the intervention by the KEAC, the federal administrator responsible for the application of Section 23 of the agreement took the steps necessary to submit the project to the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement federal review process.

Upon request from the Kativik Regional Government, the KEAC advised the former on the various components of Section 23 that required inclusion in a Memorandum of Understanding, or MOU, which was signed by the major parties, namely: Kativik Regional Government, federal administrator for Section 23, and the Minister of the Environment.

The MOU incorporates into the EARP process the substance and intent of Section 23.4. It requires that the KEAC first be consulted on terms

Marchand, Sub.

of reference of the Panel, and, two, review any variations to the EARP process beyond those contained in the MOU to ensure conformity to the substance and intent of Section 23.4.

The KEAC has reviewed the terms of reference, and while it was generally satisfied that the central components of Section 23 were incorporated, made several comments to the FEARO, and the KEAC is pleased to note that the majority of its comments were incorporated into the final draft. We have reviewed the Draft Guidelines which determine the contents of the Impact Statement.

It is essential that they be clear, comprehensive and precise in order to avoid confusion in the latter stages of the review, which can be costly in terms of time, money and effort.

In general terms, the proposed guidelines for the preparation of the EIS cover the basic issues at stake and correspond to Section 23, Schedule 3, of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement which identifies the content of an EIS.

However, at the outset, the KEAC is concerned with three fundamental aspects of the application of the review process to the project presently under review.

First, the process as applied to this project is flawed at the outset in that the Panel is reviewing an activity that is already taking place

Marchand, Sub.

and where irrevocable decisions have already been taken. This is contrary to both the EARP and Section 23 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. It is the intention of both processes to assess a project as early in the planning stage as possible, and before irrevocable decisions are taken. In the case of low level flying activities, the project is reviewed a posteriori, or after the fact.

Second, the KEAC is concerned that while the review is taking place, no further irrevocable decisions be made. The credibility of the review process would be undermined if new agreements on the use of Goose Bay for low level flight training continue to be negotiated between Canada and its allies. The KEAC therefore recommends that the Panel request from the proponent a commitment that no further agreements be negotiated under the review process has been fully completed.

Third, the KEAC is concerned about the efficiency of the process in the application of the guidelines to the EIS. For this project, the initiator and the proponent are one and the same and the time factor for the review appears important. In order to avoid poissible delays, the KEAC recommends that the Panel request that the proponent submit a draft of an EIS document outlining its proposed structure and content. The KEAC also

Marchand, Sub.

recommends that the proponent obtain periodic feedback from the Panel or its Secretariat throughout the preparation of the EIS.

In addition to these fundamental issues, several components of the guidelines appear vague and several issues, some minor and others of more importance, could benefit or profit from being clarified. What follows are the major comments of the KEAC with respect to the project as it affects northern Quebec in particular.

It is the Committee's opinion that the two activities under review should be defined as: Project 1, low flying activities; and Project 2, Training Centre.

Not only does reference to two components of the same project make the text confusing, but it fails to clearly distinguish between the two separate mandates which have been given to the Panel.

It is essential that the public and the proponent have a clear understanding of the Panel's mandate with respect to Project 1 and Project 2. In the case of present and future low level flight training, the Panel's mandate described in the Guidelines, is the following:

> "The low level flight training has been occurring since 1980, and it is expected to continue and possibly to increase in the coming years. The Panel has been

Marchand, Sub.

asked to assist the proponent in designing these activities further to minimize any negative impact."

This definition of the Panel's mandate leads to a series of questions, for instance: Why does the Panel not have the mandate to recommend whether or not low level flight training should proceed and, if so, under what conditions? If called for, can the Panel recommend a reduction in the present number of flights? Can the Panel recommend a limit to the future number of flights? A clear indication of the limits of the Panel's mandate with respect to Project 1 is required.

In this respect, the Panel and the public should be provided with copies of the existing agreements, their duration, the increased level of activity, so that both can get a clear understanding of the limitations of the EARP review.

The KEAC endorses the Panel's recommendation that the proponent adopt and implement the requirements for organizing and conducting ecological impact studies as established by Beanlands and Duinker, 1983, pp. 91-95.

In this respect, it is important that the proponent consider all valued ecosystem components including activities, resources or environmental features of importance to local populations. It should be noted that the guidelines do not sufficiently

Marchand, Sub.

stress the need for an analysis of the impacts of the terrestrial and aquatic environments.

The Panel indicates that it expects the proponent to make full use of data from other countries which have or are still practicing low level flight training, or which have training centers. The details should include a description of the known impacts, both positive and negative, of the project.

Concerning Guideline No. 5, or the identification of the key issues, it is our belief that the issue of the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife should include an assessment of the sudden and unpredictable nature of the noise. For instance, what are the psychological, physiological and behavioural reactions like escape and avoidance responses, fear, panic, et cetera.

About issue number nine, in order to avoid confusion and false expectations in dealing with the land claims issues versus land claims policy, the Panel should provide more direction on this question. Both the proponent and the public would benefit from this clarification.

The proponent should be made clearly aware of the principle of the native right to harvest provided for in Section 24 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

The Committee has a few suggested improvements regarding the contents of the

Marchand, Sub.

Environmental Impact Statement, and of its summary.

Both the EIS and its summary should contain a short but accurate statement of existing agreements and their specific conditions, as well as an understanding that no further agreements will be negotiated until the review process has been completed. It should also include maps that will indicate the precise location of Zones 1, 1A and 1B, such that the general public reviewing the EIS or reading the summary has a clear understanding of the scope of the project under review.

Furthermore, the section on project justification should justify and demonstrate how the project fits into internationl, national agreements or treaties. The supporting documents should be tabled. It would also be appropriate for the proponent to provide an understanding of the selection process which has led to the adoption of the low level training areas. This would help the Panel in its evaluation of alternative sites, or in the possibility of modifying existing boundaries. In this respect, the proponent should also clearly describe the requirements with respect to the land it needs, its area and characteristics, not only of the low flight areas, but also of the associated target practice areas. The selection for the target practice areas should be clearly documented.

Concerning the known future phases of

Marchand, Sub.

project, presumably this refers to existing signed agreements and not to agreement now being negotiated, the KEAC is is concerned with the apparent lack of definition of the exact scope of this project.

However, in the event that the proponent requests, in the future, to expand, reduce or modify the boundaries of the low level training zones, it should specify how it will comply with procedures to review the request.

The KEAC is of the opinion that in the case when the proponent requests an expansion of the flight corridor over northern Quebec, that authorization will need to be sought from the federal administrator.

The KEAC found that the guidelines provided to the proponent for the description of the low level flight training project were not specific enough in addressing essential project components, such as: Item Number 10, requesting a description of the procedures in effect for preventing straying, accidental or deliberate, from prescribed flight courses. The proponent should describe disciplinary actions taken for violation of prescribed flight paths and altitudes. There have been several claims by Native groups that pilots have deliberately deviated from prescribed flight paths for the purposes of testing their skills by flying over campsites or people. Is there a means of verifying flight recorders to confirm alleged deviations from prescribed flight

Marchand, Sub.

paths, for example?

For item number four: Information relating to the maximum numbers and types of aircraft provided for in the signed agreements which could be engaged in low level flight training in various time frames, day, year or seasons, of the projected life span of the project should be provided by the proponent. A description of how the military intends to inform the affected population of its flight schedules should also be described. The KEAC suggests that there might be an advantage to have the military indicate their flight times to local populations and outfitters, thus avoiding wasted hunting, fishing or trapping time and minimizing the effects of unexpected approach by planes.

For item number 15: In the draft guidelines an analysis of the economic benefits attributable to low level flight training is asked for. Conversely, the Committee believes that an analysis of the impact on the Native and non-Native economies should also be requested.

The Tactical Weapons Ranges component of the Training Centre should not only provide information on the potential locations, including site selection criteria, mechanisms and detailed operation of both land and sea ranges but also similar information should be requested for site alternatives. Information on the types of activities that will be carried out at each of the ranges identified should be

Marchand, Sub.

described in comprehensive layman's language.

In the existing guideline concerning socio-economic and resource use data, little mention is made of consultative mechanisms to be used by the proponent to determine the population's perception of the project, their concerns and expectations. Although the Panel is consulting the public through its public hearing and its Secretariat, the proponent should include in the EIS a description of the public's perception of the project and its anticipated impacts, both positive and negative. The KEAC is of the opinion that, through direct consultation of all groups affected, a survey of the values, goals and aspirations of the Native people could and should be obtained. This survey should highlight the viewpoints of the Naskapi, Inuit and other groups affected by the project.

For item nine: A further expression of preferred local resource use is usually found in regional resources development plans. Although an urban development plan for Happy Valley-Goose Bay is requested, summary of the land use plan for the territory is not. Do land use plans for the territory exist and, if so, what are their characteristic The proponent should consult the agencies responsible for land use planning in the region.

Now, a few words about mitigative measures, residual impacts and monitoring program.

Marchand, Sub.

Although the Guidelines devote a section to both monitoring mechanisms and mitigative measures, they are discussed in general terms without describing in any specific detail what should be mitigated or monitored. Although the KEAC recognizes that a comprehensive list of mitigation measures and elements requiring monitoring can be determined only after the evaluation of impacts, it is possible to include in the Guidelines some level of detail as to what the Panel expects the proponent to include in the EIS.

For example, it is evident at the outset that the monitoring program should include the monitoring of the impacts on the George River caribou herd. It should also include the monitoring of health effects on the human population. A partial list of mitigation measures and elements to be monitored should be included in the Guildelines to give the proponent a sense of direction and to minimize the need for additional information during the EIS review.

In addition to identifying who will be responsible for individual mitigative measures or damages, including those caused by personnel or equipment belonging to a non-Canadian organization, the Panel should request a description of mechanisms set in place to ensure compliance by the allied nations. The same applies to the monitoring program.

The proponent should be requested to

Marchand, Sub.

describe the role of the populations affected by the activities in the design and implementation of the monitoring program. The concept of local and Native participation should be introduced here.

Item 6.8(b): There is insufficient emphasis in this section on the link between a monitoring program and the identification and implementation of mitigative measures which are the fundamental objectives of a monitoring program. The KEAC suggests that paragraph (b) read as follows:

> "To identify, and evaluate and mitigate impacts that were not or could not be predicted."

Some concluding comments: The KEAC, whose mandate is to oversee the environmental and social protection regime for the Kativik region, hopes that the preceding comments will aid the Panel in ensuring that the environment and social milieu of the Kativik region are protected.

This is, after all, the fundamental objective of the EARP process and for the environmental and social protection regime for which our committee is responsible.

In order to fulfill this objective, the review process must have the ability to bring about appropriate changes to the activities planned. Although, at the outset, the present review process is somewhat flawed in that certain irrevocable

Marchand, Sub.

decisions have already been taken. The KEAC is confident that the final Guidelines will provide the proponent with a solid base upon which all significant impacts of the project will be evaluated. In this respect, the KEAC strongly recommends that no further irrevocable decisions or commitments be taken by the proponent until the process is fully completed.

The KEAC is looking forward to receiving the final EIS Guidelines and the EIS itself, which we intend to comment on during the second series of public hearings. In the meantime, we wish to be associated with the present process by being kept informed about significant developments that may occur. In keeping with our mandate to serve as a preferential and official forum for environmental concerns in the region, we remain available to both the Panel and the proponent for advice on issues concerning the Kativik region.

The KEAC wishes to thank the Panel for providing it and other groups or members of the public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines of the project. We sincerely hope that the review process will serve to ensure that the environmental and social impacts of the project will be duly considered in the decisions which will eventually be taken by the Ministers of the Environment and National Defence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Marchand. This is certainly one of the more detailed and lengthy presentations containing comments on the Draft Guidelines that the Panel has received so far and we certainly appreciate the time and effort that must have gone into its preparation.

I wonder if any Member of the Panel wishes to ask a question concerning any point in this presentation? It is obviously a very well prepared submission.

Major McCabe, would you like to ask something?

MAJOR McCABE: Sir, I have a couple of questions. I have been travelling with the Panel through all of these hearings and, despite the fact I have spent two years myself in Goose Bay, I am learning a great deal about the north and about, in fact, such agreements as the James Bay/Northern Quebec Agreement of which I know very little, unfortunately.

I have one question which comes to mind and also something you did comment on during your presentation that maybe you could help out on. I believe earlier today mention was made of the importance of the outfitters, for example, and I guess that applies to commercial operations for hunting and fishing and also, I assume, aircraft available to the local people taking them out to their traditional camps, et cetera. I assume that is outfitters. I am not sure; possibly that is other people.

In my travel to Schefferville, for example, I gather there are a lot of these outfitters. It is a seasonal thing, I understand, but there obviously are a lot in the northern region. Has there ever been a study, an environmental or socio-economic study done pertaining to the outfitter operations or to light aircraft operations in this area?

MR. MARCHAND: Not to my knowledge, in that area. I know that locations of outfitters camps can be obtained but not to my knowledge. Maybe, but I do not know.

MAJOR McCABE: Because we are talking about aircraft again here, and, in fact, as I mentioned in my presentation, there probably exists more studies on the effects of light aircraft and helicopters of the kind that I am talking about here on wildlife than there is on the military. I have read some of those and I see differences of opinions and effects of these aircraft. Because I read in some of those that there are suggestions of negative effects or detrimental effects, I would assume that there might, at some time in the future, be a requirement -- let us say there is a desire to increase the number of outfitters in a certain area, an arbitrary number, 10 outfitters each with a few airplanes. With the mandate that the KEAC has, could I assume that an environmental and socio-economic study would have to be done for that kind of an increase?

MR. MARCHAND: When we talk about possible negative impacts of flights, specifically for this region here, we had some discussion about this and when we met, I remember, in April, we discussed this problem. As you know, the outfitting industry, in fact, sells wilderness to tourists or sport hunters and we had the feeling that an increase or an awareness of the existence of flights in the region could alter the perceived safety of people coming into the region, for instance. At the same time, it can provide a loss in the apparent wilderness which is experienced when someone comes to northern Quebec to go caribou hunting.

When you have people coming from the States to spend a few days in the bush and they hear some planes coming around, I think it might be a problem. But I agree with you that it could be and it should be documented more, maybe through surveys, I do not know. But I think that there is a need to know a little bit more about impacts, for instance, in the upper George River where many good outfitters are in that region. I do not think we have any ready-made answers on this but I think that it is a good point to be addressed.

MAJOR McCABE: I am leading up to something here.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: Excuse me, could I just add something to that, please, for a moment. As I recall the regime, if a new outfitting camp is established that can take more than 30 persons, it is subject to an environmental and social impact study. If a new camp is built that can acommodate less than 30 people, no, it is exempt from study. Thirty and and it would go through the appropriate process under Section 23 of the regime, which I think is the direct answer to the question you were posing.

MAJOR McCABE: That does answer part of my question. I am thinking possibly more of, rather than one outfitter wanting to increase, let us say something changed in the whole potential or attractivenes to increase this kind of activity. Let us say there was a significant increase indicated or desired, not just one outfitter. Obviously, that would have the potential of a significant impact and I would, therefore, assume that some kind of a fairly comprehensive study would have to be done along those guidelines. Would it?

DR. WILKINSON: I think the answer to that really is that just in the way that the militar activities are required to study the cumulative effect of what they are doing and of what everyone else in the area is doing, I think that is how the regime would take account of the multiplier effects, as it were, of individual outfitting camps.

In addition to which there is another committee, the Hunting/Fishing/Trapping Co-ordinating Committee, which is yet another body that oversees, amongst other things, the long range planning of the establishment and operation of outfitting camps.

So, I think the answer to your question is the concern would be covered; it would not necessarily be covered by the kind of study that you are asking about, but it would be covered as a result of the hunting, fishing and trapping regime and certain other aspects of the environmental and social protection regime. So, what you are asking about would in fact be done but not in quite the way you are asking.

MAJOR McCABE: Okay. I will not pursue that any further.

The other thing I wanted to ask, you mentioned or suggested that it might be constructive for the military to advise their daily flight plans to the public, to the outfitters, et cetera, to help with flight safety, et cetera. Would it be fair to suggest that the reverse might also be true. That if the military was advised -- for example, the Military Co-ordination Centre was advised when outfitters were going into existing areas or also if certain camps that exist in those areas were going to be occupied, with the objective of having the military avoid the camps, for example, or having the military having an extra look-out for civilian aircraft in a certain area; would that also be a positive suggestion?

MR. MARCHAND: I think that the idea is good but the problem is the following. To make sure that an outfitter gives, for instance, Goose Bay

Airport some information about where the parties of sport hunters are, it might be easy in the sense that major outfitters are often equipped with high frequency radio telephone systems or a link between their camps in the bush or in the George River area and Goose Bay Airport.

In the case of hunters or trappers, it is more difficult. First of all, they move a lot. They do not necessarily stay two weeks at the same place, they usually use tents or small equipment and most of the time they are not equipped with easy links, with telephone systems to get in touch with the Goose Bay Airport in the sense that, for instance, some Crees or some Inuit are equipped with bush radios like the CP-24 made by Marconi. There is no phone patch between those kinds of tranceivers, for instance, and the Bell Telephone system. So, I think that it might be a technical problem but the problem is for hunters and trappers it is more difficult to let Goose Bay Airport know about their location and their intentions for the coming weeks, for instance.

MAJOR McCABE: I am referring more not to individual hunters and trappers. I appreciate the problem there. I am talking about camps where -- traditional camps, for example, for the Native people where they would go in and, say, use it as a base camp with a number of families, which is the kind of thing that we would prefer, obviously, to try to avoid. That is one thing.

Also, the flying aspect from the outfitters or whoever else might be flying the civilian aircraft, to be able to let the military know.

MR. MARCHAND: In the case of, for instance, temporary shelters which is a kind of flexible formula for outfitting, I know that most of the time the Department of Fish and Game for the Province of Quebec, MLCP, usually keep track of locations for those temporary shelters used by some groups of hunters. Technically speaking, those temporary shelters can have more than 30 people because, technically speaking, this kind of small project should have to go through the Environmental Assessment Review procedures. So, this is one thing.

I think the problem here is the problem of communication between many groups. For instance, there are some bush pilots that fly from the south to the regions near Schefferville. I guess that pilot might know about the zones used in the area, the LLTA's. You know, the problem is that since the proponent is carrying some activities in the region -- I know that both can try to get in touch to find out what is going on but I know it has been a problem.

For instance, there have been some requests in the past from the Goose Bay Airport to identify a location of campers or trappers or Natives and, in itself, it is a problem because I cannot tell you for two days where someone will be but I can say what the plans of the person will be for the coming week, for instance. So, I think that there is a need to find a solution to this.

This morning I was talking with the members of our committee and we are just thinking about a system of tranceivers that could be sponsored, for instance, by the proponent. It might be a formula by which parties of trappers and hunters could contact each other and, at the same time, might be warned by DND about special exercises or practice in some areas. I think that a formula has to be found through consultation with Native, hunters, trappers and outfitters.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the importance of questions like this but, in fairness to the other scheduled speaker for this evening, I wonder if we could bring this to a conclusion as quickly as possible.

MAJOR McCABE: I will leave that, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, again, Mr. Marchand.

Our final scheduled speaker for this evening is Mr. George Koneak, who is going to speak as the President of Angovigaq. Whenever you are ready, Mr. Koneak.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. GEORGE KONEAK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

G. Koneak, Sub.

I will have to go through the interpreters. I want my Native fellows here to be able to understand me and you. Since I do not have copies of my presentation -- unfortunately, I do not have a copy of my presentation, although I see that it is better that you have it in hand. Anyway, I will continue.

These are my main reasons for speaking to you. The reasons are for my children and my children's children. We do not live in the agricultural area and also we do not keep livestock and fences. Also, we do not have any slaughterhouses.

In regard to Beluga whales, we are told that they are few in number now, so the government tells us they do not want people to hunt too many whales, including seals and polar bear, fish, cod, salmon and char that are in the salt water. Also, caribou, bear, foxes, wolves, rabbits, wolverines that are on the land. Migratory birds, ducks, geese, snow geese, ptarmigan. They use the water and the land to eat from that. In the water, fish.

Also, the fish and the food that they live off of in the lakes, all of these have to be considered. There would be no more animals if the training starts and also the low level flights begin. In the surrounding area there will be no animals left. It is also close to the Inuit. Plus, all of this should be documented so that it will be known by all.

If all this happens in the future and if

G. Koneak, Sub.

the animals had nothing more to feed on with pollution and other things that will affect their food and if the animals start dying off, then I see a picture in front of me that we will start saying that our concerns were not being considered because of this. What we see today on T.V., we Inuit will be seen like the Ethiopians.

If there was no activity of any sort, the people living in the area would have been well off but, since there were wars and this kind of thing happening, people suffering from starvation and famine, I see that we Inuit will be in the same situation. These are the reasons why I wanted to speak to you.

I would like to thank you for listening to our views, so everything that I said will be remembered by our children.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Koneak.

I wonder if anyone else has decided that they would like to speak to the Panel tonight. We have come a long distance from our respective homes to visit Kuujjuaq and we have some time left tonight. While we are here we would really like to hear from anyone who would like to get up and speak to us.

MR. JACQUES GIGUÈRE: I have a question for Major McCabe. Why is it that there is no training in winter?

MAJOR McCABE: There are probably a number of reasons. One of them would be that, obviously, in the summertime, particularly in the northern regions here, the daylight hours are longer, the weather is a little more moderate in its temperatures which makes it a little easier to conduct the outdoor activity of working on aircraft and that. That kind of thing is really probably the main reason. Also, there really has not been a need to -- there has not been a requirement to have that much training that would require 12 months of the year to do it.

I think probably the main reasons are the temperatures and the limited hours of daylight, although, of course, the aircraft can fly at night but the most beneficial training is really gained during the day. That is probably about the best answer.

MR. STAS OLPINSKI: I would like to ask -- I guess this is perhaps a silly question after the fact but why exactly are these low level flights being conducted? Is it in order for these fighter planes to be able to avoid radar or what are the specific reasons for the low level flights to be done?

MAJOR McCABE: That is not a silly question. I do not believe in such a thing of something being a silly question. If someone has something they want to know, please ask it.

In fact, you are exactly correct. The main reason that low level flights are done is it is one of the main means of survival in today's technology, if you like, of radar detection and that is to be able to fly low. That is the primary reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind people asking questions to give their names just for the record, please.

The next person, please?

MS CAMILLE MAGEAU: Camille Mageau, KEAC.

I was just wondering if Major McCabe could tell us whether DND has in its library or its archives any video or audio material that the community could have access to so they could identify with the types of aircraft we are dealing with, the types of sounds we are dealing with because probably most of the people here have not had direct experience, the same way as some of our colleagues in Labrador have had. Is there something that -- some material that could sensitize them to the problem and the types of projects we are dealing with here?

MAJOR McCABE: I do not know if we have anything in the way of video or film nature that is specifically oriented to this kind of information. Obviously, we have many films that happen to have some aircraft in them which, I would suggest, would be of a very limited use for the kind of thing you are talking about. We have, obviously, pictures that could be provided to show what at least the airplane looked like.

I think you mentioned to give an idea of noise? A film cannot give you proper idea of that kind of thing, I am sorry to say. Really, you are talking more about an education process of familiarizing people with some of this rather complex equipment. Yes, that kind of thing can be provided.

MS MAGEAU: I am not thinking of a course in aeronautics, I am just merely --

MAJOR McCABE: No, I know. I think you are talking about what is a Tornado, what is a Phantom, what kind of airplanes can these people expect to see, because the names of them are mentioned from time to time. They are in the proposal, I think. I have spoken about them. If that is the sort of thing you mean, then certainly that kind of information can be provided but I do not know if that is enough.

MS MAGEAU: Just for the sake of argument, a 15 decibel or a sound level in numerics is not going to mean anything. It does not mean anything to me unless I hear it and it is not likely to mean anything to the people here unless they hear it. If we are asking them to make some comment and to make some commitment to accepting that type of activity without giving them any idea what they are getting into, I just do not think it is fair.

MAJOR McCABE: Okay. I understand a little more what you mean. I know that studies have been done of many kinds of things that make noise that decibel levels are recorded. That kind of information could be used, I think, to make comparisons because there would be things in there that people would be familiar with. For example, even some of the aircraft that are used regularly around here, we have decibel levels for those. So, the people would be used to that. That kind of information can certainly be provided.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would somebody else like to get up and speak? Yes, sir, go ahead.

MR. JOHNNY PETERS: I am proud to be a Canadian but I am really concerned about this training program proposal. We always have various meetings through Anguvigaapik and there a number of people here that we hold meetings with regard to the wildlife and various concerns of the people. It seems like it was only during the course of the year that we were informed about this low flying aircraft program, which we should have been informed of long before it happened. It seems like they were doing this without informing us at all.

I know there is going to be some kind of impact on the wildlife and the people up here, no matter how you see it. It was put on our agenda for the first time this year during one of our meetings. I am getting more and more concerned. We often have meetings on various problems that we face trying to solve various problems that concerns us. This one is a big problem to us. I guess it was only when the

Indian people, various Indian groups or Inuit of Labrador, started voicing their concern on this that it was brought to our attention. Although this Goose Bay area has been used by the military groups for many now, they want to expand it. It has come up to this, although you are saying they will not expand it before the studies are completed. I am still stressing that I am opposing this proposal and I am sure you can find areas where it will not affect people directly. There is lot of space in other parts of the country.

They want to do this training program in another country but, since there are too many people overseas, they decided to put it here in Canada. It seems to me that we are less important people than the other people in the other countries and I see that it is not going to decrease at all. It seems to me that we are not very important people besides the other groups in the world.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Would anyone else like to speak to us tonight? Would you give your name, please?

MR. STAS OLPINSKI: My name is Stas Olpinski, I am a biologist with the Makivik Research Department.

In the event that the NATO project is given a go-ahead, does this mean that there could be concurrent expansion of the existing situation, the existing project in Goose Bay at the same time as the

NATO project would be implemented? That is the first part of my question.

The second part is could you give us an idea of what the projected lifespan of this NATO project would be. Would this be an indefinite lifespan or would it be for five years, 10 years or how long?

MAJOR McCABE: I will answer your second question first. The scope of this project and the on-going requirement for this kind of training leaves no doubt in my mind that it is very much a long range, indefinite termination type of thing. The money that would be put into this, the fact that training -- even if technologies change, training systems can be also changed and adapted without changing the basic structure or area that you need would certainly support the fact that this would be very much a long range facility.

With respect to your first question, the proposed expansion of the current activity is very much in the immediate future, as far as a proposal. As far as it happening -- or if the NATO Centre goes in, would there be expansion of the current activity; I would say, no, because that expansion would have happened a long time before. The NATO project -- you will not see that. If we see it at all, you are not going to see it for many years yet. So, it would not be going on at the same time, as far as an increase.

We assume that there might be both kind

of activities going on. In other words, the current kind of activity would still be going on at that time. It may be absorbed somewhat into the NATO Centre but I do not think, if I understood your question correctly, you would be seeing an expansion of this current activity going on at the time they are putting the NATO Centre in.

MR. MARCHAND: My name is Pierre Marchand, KEAC.

I have a general question. When you take a look at flight supplement, which is a public document, and when you take a look at all the issues of the flight supplement, you see that there have been training areas for years in this province. I know that in the early seventies there was a training zone near Bagotville. I remember that in 1971 I could see a big Vulcan delta bomber from Great Britain.

I found out that years ago there was a training area near, let us say, northeast of Great Whale River or Kuujuarivik in the Hudson's Bay region. When I took a brief look at the 1986 flight supplement, I saw that in the Province of Quebec there is still a turning area north of Bagotville for the U.S. Air Force. I was surprised to see that there is a big one in the Gaspé used by Chatham, New Brunswick and, you know, there are some training areas between Trenton and Ottawa and places like that. I have a general question.

I would like to know -- maybe Major

McCabe could give a reply on that point -- in terms of decision-making or in terms of negotiations, when the Department of National Defence for itself or on behalf of, let us say, RAF, the Germans or the U.S. Air Force, wants to use an area in terms of square miles, is there any consultation between the Department and the province or a territorial government or what is the procedure that is used?

MAJOR McCABE: There are probably a couple of parts to an answer to that. The areas that you refer to in the flight supplement that exist, in fact, in many parts of Canada, the majority have existed for a long, long time. The kind of activity in those areas have changed probably in some cases; in other cases, it has remained the same. Some of the areas are low level routes. The difference between those and the areas that we have in Labrador and over Quebec are that they are specific routes, something similar to a specific route on a map, I suppose. It is not a general area. They have routes laid down which, by existing aeronautical regulations in Canada, aircraft can fly to certain altitudes within the defined area of those routes. When they are set up, they are studied. Again, I am speaking of the past here, when they were set up the obvious things of being away from towns and this kind of thing were certainly looked at.

The existing regulations for any kind of future development, they have to go through much more stringent examination and criteria because of the kinds of changes in government regulations that the Chairman referred to.

For example, the Americans have submitted requests for a certain number of low level routes in the north for the B-52 bomber training. Some of those already exist; they wanted to have some more. I know some of them have already been turned down, others are undergoing a similar kind of environmental study. So, in answer to your question, there are much more involved studies and approval processes that go through -- that are required to go through the whole system nowadays. The existing ones, I do not have too much knowledge about but I know they are still reviewed from time-to-time to ensure that something has not come up that might infringe on activity. They are monitored in that sense.

MR. DAVID OOKPIK: I am David Ookpik. I want to ask one question in particular. There were nine different things that have to be studied. There was one thing that I wanted to ask. They mentioned earlier that some animals that have not been affected in the past 45 years. How did you go about this study that they were not affected?

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, I suspect Mr. Ookpik is referring to the initial environmental evaluation document that reached some conclusions about no impact. Would you be able to respond to that question?

MAJOR McCABE: As I mentioned earlier, that initial environmental evaluation was a process of studying existing data, other studies that had been done in other parts of the country, in other parts of the continent of North America, in other parts of the world in some cases, to try to get any kind of information that existed on effects or impacts of this kind of activity. That is really the kind of thing that was done there. As well, specialists on various animals and that were consulted and were asked to comment on their opinions or their thoughts on potential impacts. That is sort of a general answer but I do not know if I can really get too much more specific.

Also, of course, we base some of it on our experience on other military bases that have been around for a long time and the animal populations that exist in those areas. Some studies, of course, have been done with respect to that. I do not know if that is a good enough answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: We still have a little time left. I would like to offer now one more opportunity. Yes, sir. Please give your name before you speak.

MR. SANDY SAUNDERS: Sandy Saunders, Kuujjuaq. Do you know how high the jets have to be flying in Canada, the altitude? Could you answer, please?

MAJOR McCABE: There are a variety of

regulations which apply to all kinds of aircraft, be they military or civilian and they vary from region to region. These particular areas that we have depicted on the map, military aircraft are allowed in those areas to go down as low as 100 feet above the ground. Outside of those areas in what we call uncontrolled airspace, aircraft on approved low level routes can fly as low as 250 feet. In all other areas where there is not any particular routes, aircraft are required to fly no lower than 1,000 feet or they can go down to 500 feet if they are doing what they call avoiding action, say running into weather or something.

So, that gives you a bit of the cross-section of the different altitudes.

MR. SAUNDERS: Is that the altitude that they have to be flying? Is it a law that -- is it a Canadian law? It seems to me that you are breaking the law if you fly even lower than that.

I also have another question. The jets that fly at supersonic speeds can even break glass because they are flying so low. If the jets were at a point breaking eardrums in human beings, would the victims be compensated for this kind of problem if they damaged something or if there was damage to their eardrums, for example?

MAJOR McCABE: Your first comment on breaking the law. The regulations are Canadian law. If aircraft fly -- and I emphasize aircraft I do not say military because it applies to civilians as well. If aircraft fly below altitudes as permitted by Canadian regulation, they can be violated, be they Canadian civilians, American military or civilians or anybody else. They are expected, as everybody that drives on the road in Canada is subject to provincial -- usually provincial or local speed regulations. If you violate them and you get caught, you can be charged for it.

The business of speeds, aircraft have flown supersonic over Labrador and Quebec for the last 15 or 20 years. Most of it has been at high level or medium level. There is absolutely no documentation to support the suggestion that aircraft have broken human eardrums. I know that allegation has been made. There are no documented cases of that and I can give you a good example of people who go by the millions to air shows and spend three or four hours being very closely flown over by jets at high speeds and other aircraft. There are certainly no broken eardrums there, either.

There is a medical study that is on-going at this time that is looking into health related issues and the jets in Goose Bay. It is being done by the Canadian Public Health Association and they are doing very detailed examinations of the effects of the noise of these aircraft on humans and other kinds of health problems that may result from that.

MR. MICHAEL BARRETT: My name is Michael

Barrett. I would just like to make a few general comments to the Panel.

First of all, I am pleased to see that the federal government appears now to be taking the review of this project very seriously, that it appears to have put together a very competent panel and allocated resources to it so that it can function. Also, that the Panel is taking time to consult with all the communities involved.

What does not seem very correct is that it has taken so long to put this process together. This process should have begun in 1980 or 1981 and that it may have only been from public pressure that the process has been undertaken. Even with the James Bay Agreement, we were not even aware of the flights until reports came in. I have heard tonight that there is a Centre in Goose Bay where you can call to say where your camp is, where your outfitting activities are. We were not aware of it here and we should have been.

The other general comment I would like to mention is about the change we have had in the military. In the 1940's there were thousands of empty drums and scrap left here in the building of the original base in Kuujjuaq. In the 1950's and 1960's with the mid-Canada line between Kuujuarivik and Schefferville there is approximately 40 sites of abandoned buildings. We still have fuel oil from these sites and other fuel leaking into the water systems. That has not been cleaned up. Now, we are in the 1980's and we have a different type of pollution, we have loud, shocking noises, we have aircraft possibly putting out fuel flying at low levels. It is another type of pollution, it is another type of change and it is going to have some impact. I do not think we can trust National Defence to look after everyone's interests. I think the Panel must look very closely at these projects and that also the general public, everyone, has to follow this very closely.

So, I think all of us will be watching and will be participating very closely in the process in the coming year. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comments, sir. Indeed, we on the Panel are quickly beginning to realize that we are being watched very closely by a lot of different parties and we will think very carefully about what you have said. Thank you.

Major McCabe, do you wish to respond in some way to that?

MAJOR McCABE: Just to echo your comments on what you perceive as a change in the federal government. The military is part of the federal government as well and we are also undergoing a change. If you are not aware of it, a very expensive program has been approved and tenders are already being sought to clean up some of the messes in the past, which incidentally were a good number of American sites not Canadian, but we are paying for them. Those are being cleaned up. It is going to be a long process and, as much as possible, local people are going to be involved in this. The intent is to restore abandoned sites to as close as their original natural condition as possible. So, I assure you that that has not been ignored and that is underway right now. In fact, just on the way up here I saw an advertisement in a newspaper requesting tenders for this kind of activity in some areas on the Labrador coast. So, we are trying to change, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe we have another speaker. Would you give your name, please?

MR. WILLIE MAKUIK: My name is Willie Makuik from Kuujjuaq. I just want to make a small comment. I am not going to ask you any questions.

The Inuit of northern Quebec have had a James Bay Agreement since 1975. It is now 1986 and the shopping lists that the Inuit wanted, when the Agreement was signed, has not been fulfilled yet. Like the proper roads, the proper waste disposal sites, waste water sites, all the community infrastructure that is needed to properly maintain the community and to service it.

It seems to me that National Defence gets all the money they need to carry out the work they want to do but, when the Native people across the country ask for something to improve the living conditions in their communities, their requests are often delayed. Like, we have not got the money this year, you will have to wait for another year. This is the kind of story that we have been getting for the last over 15 years. I hope the Panel will take this into account, that the Native people of Labrador do not have their Agreement yet. But the Inuit people of Labrador have a lower standard of living than we do here in northern Quebec. Most of their houses have no running water, most of the people still have to get their own wood or buy their own wood to burn. So, the differences in the regions are very noticeable. I think the Government of Canada should speed up the process of Native claims so that the Native groups across the country can benefit what they should be getting now but should have gotten long ago. I wanted to make this statement.

I have one question left and that is who has more clout in the departments of the Government of Canada, National Defence or Indian Affairs? All the money Indian Affairs needs is not there but, when National Defence wants it, they get it. So, with those Agreements with the NATO countries, I am sure they are getting a few bucks from these countries, too.

We ourselves pay our taxes and we also want to see our Native friends across the country benefiting from what is rightfully theirs.

In concluding, the cost of transportation in northern Quebec communities is very high. When the Armed Forces requires something for their personnel, they are flown in with their own aircraft, so the cost is not so obvious. I think this should also be taken into account. The cost of living is very high in northern communities and in communities that relate to military activities the cost of living is not so high because everything is subsidized.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

With regard to your comments, they are just the sort of information that this Panel will certainly have to keep in mind when we are putting together a picture of the existing conditions within the area that may be affected by the project.

With regard to your question about the relative clout, as you put it, of certain departments of the Government of Canada, I would not dare attempt to try to answer that question. We have representatives from both departments here tonight. If they would care to comment, they are welcome to but I will not force them to. I see heads shaking down there, so I think not -- oh, really. Very good, Major, go right ahead.

MAJOR McCABE: The business of who has more clout. The federal departments are run by politicians. The military -- the guys who wear the uniforms are not politicians. The governments change, faces change and the heads of departments, priorities within the government based on their particular platforms or their particular policies change from time to time. I think really the clout, if you want to call it that, is up at that level. It is made by those people. I wish I could agree with you on the fact that National Defence seems to have an unlimited budget because I can assure you it does not. We are subject to all the massive economic cutbacks that all the other departments are going through and I would suggest that there is not one federal department in this country that is sitting fat right now with lots of money. If you have been able to follow any of the equipment renewal programs that the military is trying to do, if you followed any of the stories in the desperate state that the military is in as far as equipment, how ancient and out of date so much of it is, how inadequate we are prepared and equipped to do our responsibilities, I think you would realize that we do not have a lot of money around. Believe me, I wish we did, I wish it were so, but we are no different than anybody else. Everybody runs into the frustration of not being able to get what they would really like to have. We would like to have a lot more things, too, but we have to stand in line, believe me.

MS CAMILLE MAGEAU: Camille Mageau, and now I am speaking as a representative of Indian and Northern Affairs, not as KEAC. I guess the only clout that I would see exercised is this context is since my Minister is responsible for implementation of the federal responsibilities within the James Bay/ Northern Quebec Agreement. So, if there is anything that you would like to address to him in that respect, then I will carry your message home and see that something is done about it. But in terms of interfering or making any statement on the present activity on the review, I think it would not be appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for at least being brave enough to get up and speak in response to a question like that.

I believe the time has come to bring the meeting to a close. I would really like all of you for coming. I would especially like to thank those of you who have come forward and made presentations to the Panel. This has certainly been one of the more informative and more enjoyable meetings. Our trip to Kuujjuaq has certainly been worthwhile.

I appreciate your interest in the review so far and I take note of your statements that you are going to keep up your interest. That being the case, I am sure that this will not be our last visit to Kuujjuaq during the course of this review.

In closing, I would like to thank the Members of our Secretariat to the Panel; I would like to thank our Court Reporters seated over to my right; thanks also to our audio technician; and thanks, especially, to the persons who have provided us with interpretation services all day today.

Again, thank you to the residents of

Kuujjuaq and we will see you again in the not too distant future.

Goodnight.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned.

Volume

11

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	GEORGE RIVER	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 17, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	11	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO — OTTAWA — WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: School Gymnasium, Kangiqsualujjuaq (George Rive

DATE: October/octobre 17, 1986.

VOLUME: 11

INDEX

	PAGE
Welcoming by Mayor Mark Annanack	1033
Presentation by Major David McCabe	1039
Presentation by The Chairman	1057
Closing remarks by Mayor Mark Annanack	1081

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

David Ookpik	1036
Bobby Baron	1046
Mark Annanack	1047
Rejean Dumas	1048
Willie Edmudluk	1049
Bobby Baron	1051
Kitty Annanack	1053
Stanley Annanack	1054
Bobby Baron	1059
Willie Edmudluk	1064
Mark Annanack	1064
Bobby Baron (On behalf of David Annanack)	1065
Stanley Annanack	1066
Lucas Billy Etok	1067
Kitty Annanack	1068
Simeonie Baron	1070
Willie Annanack	1072
Christina Baron	1075
Tommy Emuk	1076
Willie Annanack	1076
Bobby Baron	1078
Don Stewart	1078

* * * * *

---Upon Commencing at 2:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of proposed military flying activities over parts of Quebec and Labrador.

At this time I would like to call upon the Mayor, Mr. Mark Annanack, to open the meeting.

MR. MARK ANNANACK: We have been informed about the Environmental Assessment Review Panel that they will be coming here to this community. We had been informed that they would be coming to this community, Kangiqsualujjuaq, during their trip and they are present here today. The information that has been given to us is that the military have put up a proposal to set up a training centre either in Canada or Turkey and it is open to the public to voice their views or concerns to the Panel and we are going to be provided with more information on the project. Right now they are doing this study and they want to get more information from our community as to what we think of this project.

Since it is just the first time that they are here for a public hearing, even after this meeting the consultations will continue on the training project. There is some training that is already going on in Goose Bay but the final decision as to the expansion of the project has not been reached yet but, if the decision were to go ahead that it be held here in Canada, we would like everyone to voice their concerns.

Since we do not have very much time as the meeting will have to end around four o'clock and we were late in starting this afternoon, I am asking that everyone be brief. There is someone here as well from the military group and he will give us some more information on the project proposal. After that everyone else will be given time to ask any questions, if they have any. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Annanack.

As the Mayor has said, we have come here to Kangiqsualuujuaq to listen to you. This is your meeting. We are also prepared to present you with some information and to answer your questions but the main purpose of the meeting is to hear from you. We are pleased to meet you and I will now introduce to you the other Members of the Panel.

Beginning at that end of the table there on your left is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart was formerly employed in the Canadian Armed Forces. He now lives near Ottawa where he operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who lives in St. John's, Newfoundland and who has extensive experience with wildlife of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Next to me is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik, Labrador, where he operates a small business. He is very knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in business in Sept-Iles.

At the end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson was nominated to be a Member of this Panel by the Kativik Regional Government. He has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He lives in Montreal, where he operates a business as a consultant.

I was born in St. John's, Newfoundland. I am now employed in Ottawa with an agency of the Government of Canada called the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office.

I would like you to meet some other people who have come here today with us to help us in various ways. We have three people who together form what we call a Secretariat to the Panel. One of them is not with us today but I will introduce the other two. I wish you to meet them because they can help you if you wish to receive other information about this review as time goes on. If you want to do that, then you should go to them after the meeting and give them your name and your address and they will be sure to help you. The first is Mr. Michel Bourgon; the other gentleman is Mr. Jim Clarke.

We are also very pleased to have with us today Martha Kauki who is serving as our interpreter.

The next thing we are going to do in this meeting is to ask Mr. David Ookpik to speak to you. I know that he is very well known to many people in your community and I would like to ask him now to come up to the front and speak to us all.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DAVID OOKPIK:

Thank you for being able to be here and I thank the Panel for giving me the opportunity to speak and I thank everyone here who has welcomed us to this community.

I wish to be understandable regarding various concerns for the future. We are not able to say everything that is going to happen in the future but at this time we can try.

First of all, I know that the things that are being worked on in these various projects that are going on are affecting our lifestyle. What I have heard in the past at other meetings is that we are going to be affected in some way by the low level flights. Such flights will be affecting some parts of our hunting grounds. If that were not so, it would be all right but, if this proposal goes through, there will be no going back and then it will be too late to try to voice our concerns at that time.

Ookpik, Sub:

Some hunters out in the field hunting will be affected in ways such as experiencing these low flying aircraft without notice. It might affect their hearing and I am sure it will touch them in their hearts as well. I am not trying to say that this is going to be bad or I am not trying -- I am just telling you this so that you will be aware of what might happen in the future and make everyone here who has come to the meeting aware of what is going on and I am concerned about their lifestyle as well.

There is a lot to be concerned about in this area, especially for the hunters. I wrote a report on my findings which I had passed on to this community before I came here. It explains what I am talking about. I just wanted to add a few things to it. Since this is the first public meeting, there will be other ways of consulting on this in the future. Since a human's well-being is important to everyone, we are concerned of what effect it might have on us and also to the wildlife that we live on.

If such low flying aircraft are going to be affecting the people, it will also affect the wildlife which live off the land, including fish in the lakes. Various equipment that they may be using will have loud noise and, although they are given some areas to do their flying, we can also expect that they may not always be where they are supposed to be, as

Ookpik, Sub:

has already happened from experience.

My main concern, although it will be discussed further at this meeting, is when the weather is not well and when it is storming people or hunters who are out sometimes get lost and get out of their way and that really is my concern.

Since there are some written reports and various information that has been passed to you already, you have pretty good information as of now and, if any of you do not understand, you are free to ask any questions.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone like to ask Mr. Ookpik a question? No.

Then, the next thing we would like to do is to help you understand just what the proposal is, just what is this military flying training project all about. We know that some information has already been presented to the community. I believe you have only had a short time to examine it. So, we have invited here today, to come along with us, a representative from the Department of National Defence who is going to go over some of the information which you already have and perhaps give you some other information as well so that you will understand the project.

After he has done that, he will be prepared to answer any questions that you may wish to ask about the description of the project.

Our guest is Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence and I would ask him now if he would come to the table and talk to you about the project.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen of George River. I have sat on this side of the table because I want to talk to you, the people. The Panel Members have heard my presentation many times and I would rather be able to talk directly to you so you can hear my information.

Because, it has been mentioned, we have little time and we want to give you people as much time as possible to talk to the Panel, I will try to keep my comments very short. However, as the Chairman mentioned, I would be very happy to answer questions after.

I was very pleased to see the booklet that has been produced by the Makivik Corporation. It gives good information for you. There are a few things in here which are not correct and I will mention those as I go through my presentation.

Goose Bay in Labrador was established or built in 1941 as a military base and the military have been at Goose Bay ever since that time; for 45 years. There have been many changes in the numbers of people and aircraft at Goose Bay. At its peak activity when the most people were there, there were nearly 12,000 military people and their families.

Today in Goose Bay there are military people of four countries who do different kinds of activities at the airfield. Canada has a fairly large number of people. The Canadian Forces has about 220 people. Their main jobs are to look after the radar site similar to the radars that go across the north of Canada. They also look after the air traffic control radar. The Canadian Forces has, since March of this year, established a rescue flight of three helicopters. These helicopters are in Goose Bay year round now. This is their first year.

As well, the Canadian Forces helps to service and support aircraft that come in to Goose Bay on their way to Europe, to give them fuel. The last thing that the Canadian Forces is doing in Goose Bay that is very important, it operates what is called a Military Co-ordination Centre. This Centre was built two years ago and its primary role, its main job, is to look after all of the local military flying at Goose Bay and I will talk a bit more about that in a second.

The other militaries at Goose Bay: The United States Air Force has a very small group of people, about 16 people, who look after American airplanes which come through Goose Bay from the United States on their way to Europe; also, they look after them when they come back. Again, mostly to give them fuel.

There are two countries from Europe:

Great Britain with the Royal Air Force and Germany with the German Air Force, who conduct low-flying training at Goose Bay. The Royal Air Force has been doing this kind of flying with different kinds of airplanes for the past 30 years. The German Air Force started flying in Goose Bay in 1981.

The kinds of flying that these two countries do is called low level flying and is centered mostly in two special areas, which are called low level training areas. They are marked on the map on the side of the wall, which people can look at later. Inside those areas the airplanes are allowed to go down to 100 feet above the ground, not 50 feet as it says in this pamphlet.

It was mentioned by Mr. Ookpik that sometimes the airplanes go outside of those areas. They are allowed to go outside of those areas, except they must fly higher. People must understand they may see airplanes that are outside of those areas but the pilots must fly higher than 100 feet.

Tape 10B

The Military Co-ordination Centre that I mentioned, every day when a pilot wants to fly his plane, he must come to the Centre and he marks on a map the route that he is going to fly. He files a flight plan. While he is there, the people who run the centre show him any restrictions along his route. For example, if there are many caribou migrating through a certain area, if there is an area where the caribou are calving, or if there are hunting and fishing camps which we know are occupied, then we show the pilot those areas and he is not to fly by those. If you look on the map, the northern training area has been subdivided into three small areas. That has been done so that parts of the area can be closed off. That is, military pilots will not be allowed to fly in there if, for example, there are many caribou there.

The two proposals that we are looking at with this study consist of two separate things. One is an expansion or an increase of the kind of flying that is happening here today. By an increase, I mean there will be more airplanes and a few more people. Some of the kinds of training they do will be increased a little bit but we are not talking about a lot of numbers. For example, the Royal Air Force has nine airplanes in Goose Bay right now. They may want to go up as high as 25. That is the kind of increase I am talking about.

As well, as it mentions in the book, some other countries would like to train at Goose Bay. In the book it mentions the country of Holland training at Goose Bay. That is not correct. The Government of Canada is talking with the Government of Holland towards starting this kind of training, but the Dutch pilots do not train in Goose Bay yet.

One other thing I wanted to correct in here. The Canadian Forces do not have any fighter planes at Goose Bay. We do not normally do any low flying training in Goose Bay. We have several other training areas in Canada where we do our flying.

The other project that we are looking at and is described a little bit in the pamphlet is the NATO Fighter Weapons Training Centre. That is a fancy name for a school, if you like, a flying school to teach pilots all different kinds of techniques to use when they have to fight. The Centre that is proposed is very large because the countries of NATO, that is the countries of Europe, have many airplanes. Some of those would like to come to a place where they can do training in an area where there are no communities, no towers or wires or things that they can run into.

In Europe there are many, many, many people and many communities. It is very difficult for people to train effectively and this is why they are looking for a place to build a new training centre.

It was mentioned that there are two possible sites. Goose Bay has been offered by Canada and the country of Turkey has also offered a location.

A special group of people from Europe were appointed to work on this project to come up with a scope, an idea, a basic plan of what would be needed for this project. They have made a recommendation on which site they think is the best place to build this centre. That recommendation will be looked at in different levels of NATO and, by December of this year, the senior body of NATO will make a decision on where they think the site should go.

When that decision is made, there are still another two years to plan the facility, to design it, and also to negotiate and establish an agreement with the country that has successfully received the offer.

The Training Centre is expected to be operational, that is all finished and usable by the airplanes, in the early 1990's, as long as there are no major delays along the way.

Some of the kinds of training that they will do are described in the book and I will be happy to talk more about those. I do not really want to start listing those off now, some of them may be a little bit complicated, but if people have questions I would certainly be happy to answer them on that.

If this NATO Centre comes to Goose Bay particularly if the full size centre is built, there will be obvious impacts on the community, particularly in the way of jobs or employment. This kind of facility would require a lot of new buildings, special types of buildings; it would require, possibly, a new runway. So, when the Centre is being built, during the construction phase there would be certain types of employment involved with that. Once the Centre is finished, then employment opportunities would be of a different kind. These would be involved with the day-to-day operational routine of the base.

One thing, before I close. This NATO Centre is different from what is happening in Goose

Bay right now because it is an idea. Nothing has been built, no money has been put aside for this project. It is an idea that people are working towards.

It is quite possible over the next two years, when they are planning and designing this Centre, that maybe it will cost too much to build the full size facility and we might have to make it smaller. All of that is a little ways down in time and we will have to wait and see what happens there.

The area where the flying is done: There is no real intention to come very much farther north than what is marked on the map. So, that would give you a basic idea of where the flying will be.

I know there are concerns, as Mr. Ookpik mentioned, about problems to hunters, problems to animals. I want people to understand that this idea, this kind of activity is not new. It is done in other parts of Canada and in the United States and in other countries and has been for many years. Many of the other places in Canada also have animals of different types in the training areas. In some of them people work. While people are working in there -- I use an example of oil exploration -- at a specific site, they are avoided by the airplanes. This is the kind of thing that we try to do in Labrador and Quebec.

I think that is all I want to spend time on right now, so you people have time for questions and your presentations. I would certainly be happy to take any questions at this time. Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

If anyone would like to ask the Major a question, we would like you to stand at the microphone in the middle of the room and to say your name before you begin to speak. You do not need to turn on the microphone, our technician will do that for you.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. BOB BARON: My name is Bob Baron of Angovigaq and I work for Kativik Region. I am President of Wildlife Management which serves all the communities of northern Quebec. It is a body that has been incorporated to represent the people of northern Quebec. We live off of the animals and the wildlife; we feed on them and we dress from them. Since we live off of these animals, we do not want any part of it to be affected.

Since the proposed area for low-flying aircraft touches upon a part of the Kativik region, we are concerned about it. One-third of it touches upon the Kativik region. There are fish we live off of and other species and we are trying to protect these species for our future generations to come, so they can live off the animals as we have in the past. It is too expensive to move on or to depend on store-bought foods.

If the project is to go ahead, it is to be well-planned and well-defined in that it ensures

B. Baron, Sub.

the protection of the wildlife in this region and that proper studies be carried out prior to the approval of the project. This is what Angovigaq is asking for. The calving areas for caribou, although it is restricted at certain times of the year when there is the calving season, we have to expect at some point that there will be some disturbance of these areas and various lakes that will be polluted from the low flying aircraft and those lakes and rivers that flow down to the areas where we hunt. We wish that proper studies be conducted in this area.

Although we wish that these aircraft may not come above the 55th parallel and even though they are saying they will not be coming very near here, the animals that we live off of do not know the boundaries of where they are not supposed to go to. We are the Native people of this land and we depend solely on the wildlife of this region and that is our main concern, that the animals not be affected by this project which, in turn, will affect us.

I will be back here again later. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Yes, there is a gentleman at the microphone who would like to speak.

MR. MARK ANNANACK: I would like to ask a question about what the Major was saying. He mentioned that there will be two years before anything will be happening. We would like to know how much more will be -- after two years when the decision is made, how much longer will it take before the actual training courses go on? That is my first question.

MAJOR McCABE: The NATO Centre that I have spoken about would probably not see any airplanes flying until at least probably 1992 or 1993. That is, if everything goes according to plan. So, it would be another five -- possibly five or six years after the end of this two year planning period.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have another question you would like to ask?

Would anyone else like to ask a question?

MR. REJEAN DUMAS: I would like to know if the areas that are pointed out on the map are the areas of low level flight or the complete areas where the planes are going to circulate?

MAJOR McCABE: The areas that are marked on the map right now are the areas that are presently used for low level flying. The actual areas that the NATO Centre would cover really has not been planned yet. That is what happens in the next two years. I do know that basically it is centered on top of the northern training area that is on the map. So, basically, it is the same size, the same area. That is just a rough idea. That may change but that is what they are looking at right now, if Goose Bay gets it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

MR. WILLIE EDMUDLUK: In regard to the low-flying aircraft, the Major mentioned that they are allowed to go outside the zones. If that project goes ahead and if the Training Centre is opened, will they still be allowed to go outside of the zones as marked?

MAJOR McCABE: When I mentioned that the airplanes are allowed to go outside those areas, I just said that to show that they are only limited to those areas as far as altitude. It is within those areas where they have simulated targets that they use, that they fly against, so there really is not that much interest to go outside other than once in a while they go out to just look at the scenery. Most of the flying is inside those two areas.

If the NATO Centre comes here, it will have other kinds of flying other than low level. Low level will be a small part of it. A lot of the flying will be up higher but will be basically over the same areas.

One of the main reasons for this is the airplanes only carry a certain amount of fuel and they really cannot fly very far from Goose Bay in the time that they have. Each flight is usually only an hour, maybe an hour and 15 minutes. So, they can only fly so far before they must come back.

When they fly low, they use very much

fuel, a lot of fuel. Depending on how the Training Centre is developed, that will really govern where they fly but it will tend to be in the areas that exist right now.

MR. EDMUDLUK: I have another question. If that project goes ahead, although you say that they will be given a certain area, there have been incidents twice already. We have had an experience up this river here, up George River. We have seen very low flying aircraft not very far from this area and we have had similar reports of such. I wonder if the Centre or the people in Goose Bay are aware of this. They have to be informed about the restrictions. The pilots have to be informed about the restrictions more because there have been incidents already where they have been flying very low here.

MAJOR McCABE: I do not know how low these airplanes might have been. Possibly they were lower than they should have been, possibly they were keeping the altitudes that they are allowed to keep which are not very high. As I mentioned before, from time to time some airplanes will come outside that area but very seldom. In Goose Bay the people normally know when an airplane is coming outside. If an airplane comes and is seen flying very low over a village or a camp, he is doing something that you feel he should not be doing, then that is when the people should try, if possible, to contact that Military Co-ordination Centre I mentioned. We have had several calls from people in different parts of Labrador and Quebec from time to time. When that happens, we are able to check on who it was and what he was doing because the pilots have rules they must follow, but pilots are human beings. Sometimes they do not listen, but not very often.

MR. EDMUDLUK: Thank you. I will be presenting my concerns as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else like to ask a question now, a question about the project?

Yes, sir, go ahead, please?

MR. BOB BARON: It is mentioned here that they started this training program in 1980. Since then, have you had any implications of any changes of the wildlife in that area or the people living in that area near Goose Bay? Can you inform me of that?

MAJOR McCABE: The flying that I mentioned starting in 1980 and that is mentioned in that brochure. I must remind people that there has always been, for the past 40 years, military flying of various kinds in Goose Bay. But since 1980, when there was an increase in low level flying, there have been from time to time complaints from people in the country. It is because of that kind of concern by the public that the Military Co-ordination Centre was established, to better control the military flying, to have a better understanding of where people were in the interior.

As far as effects on the animals, as far as we are concerned, the military, we have not had any evidence presented to indicate that there has been any change. There have been concerns expressed that certain things are being affected but there has been no proof to date that this was necessarily as a result of the military jets. That is the kind of thing that is being studied or will be studied during this environmental assessment that we are doing right now.

Does that answer the question?

MR. BARON: Yes, but according to some information I know, I have heard sometimes that some wildlife have been affected, especially from the Indian tribes. That, when they come home from hunting, they have to go to the hospital for hearing impaired problems and that there has been some detection that some wildlife have been affected as well. If these low level flights are going to be continued, we are asking that such problems do not arise up here as well. Some wildlife will still be affected, according to information that has been passed to us and we are concerned it might affect the animals we depend on as well.

MAJOR McCABE: The reports -- some of the stories that have come out about hearing problems and effect on the wildlife are the sort of things that are being studied in two other studies that are going on right now. One is looking specifically at health problems with respect to these military flights. I personally do not believe that the hearing problems are caused by the military flights. Once again, this military flying goes on in many other parts of Canada with no problems with the hearing.

There are studies -- I am aware of a study that is going on across northern Canada with the Native peoples to do specifically with hearing problems because there are indications in other areas that there is a high incidence of hearing problems, and that is being studied. Those are also in areas where there is no flying. So, there are studies being done to determine what kinds of things might be causing these problems.

There is a caribou study that is being done right now in Labrador, specifically with the effects of the jets of the military airplanes on the caribou. We hope that will be finished early next year and we will have some better knowledge of the possible effects on the caribou. So, I know the concerns that have been stated.

I have to emphasize that, to date, we do not have proof of what the cause necessarily is. That is why it is being studied; to try and find out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions now?

MS KITTY ANNANACK: You mentioned earlier that there are studies already going on regarding hearing impairment. I would like to ask you -- we are aware of studies that are going on regarding hearing impairment and we have been given some information on effects that have been happening in connection with these low level flights. I am asking that this study be continued. Are you going to be continuing this study or would you be able to finance or grant some money to conduct such studies?

MAJOR McCABE: There are actually two studies that I know of that are looking at hearing. One is just on hearing; the other one is specifically on health, all aspects of health, be it in the community or on things like hearing, all the things related to health. That one is being done in Goose Bay or in Labrador. The other one I mentioned on hearing is mostly being done across northern Canada. They asked to extend it to Labrador but I am not sure whether that was given approval or not. That is a separate study. It is looking at a much broader region, if you like.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question, Ma'am? Okay.

I think since we have some other speakers, we should try to end this question period fairly soon, please. Go ahead, sir.

MR. STANLEY ANNANACK: Looking at the map at the area of the low level flights, if there is an expansion on the project at the present time, the project that is going in Goose Bay which expanded would have to expand the area of the low level flights zones.

MAJOR McCABE: Not necessarily. There may be some change to the shape of the zones and I really do not know whether it would be or what direction it would be. There is a problem with extending north, which I can show on a map. It has to do with what they call an identification zone and it is mostly a defence of Canada thing. That is one of the reasons we do not like to go much further north than we currently are. But there could be some expansion or some changes.

There is plenty of room there right now for the low level flying. There really would not be a requirement to expand the low level flying, particularly. Maybe change the shape of it as a result of some recommendations that might come from this Panel, for example. That remains to be seen. I do not know.

MR. S. ANNANACK: I know that there are Inuit living in Goose Bay, between Goose Bay and Nain, and I think that they are very close to the zone. If it is expanded, they are going to be affected. If the expansion goes further north, it is going to get very close to Kangiqsualuujuaq.

MAJOR McCABE: Many of the people you mention that live along the coast, the Inuit and the Innu, many of them do go now into the areas that we use for low flying. In many cases these people have been able to let us know before they go in the general area where they will be camping and we avoid them. We have had a very good response with the people along the coast. So, that is the kind of thing that we are trying to do, is to avoid affecting the people when they do go in. It is fairly easy for us to avoid the certain areas where the people are, as long as we have an idea beforehand. Sometimes, when our pilots fly up there, they will see some people or a camp in an area that was not known. When they come back they tell their Co-ordination Centre and their other pilots. They mark a circle on the map and we avoid that for the next two or three weeks.

So, we try, as best we can, not to disturb the people when they are in the interior. We do not -- people can go into any part of that area, it is not restricted to anyone. We do not want to interfere with the normal hunting and the lifestyle of the people.

MR. S. ANNANACK: I understand, since this part is inhabited by the Inuit, I want to know, is there no other place besides this area of Goose Bay in Canada where you can conduct a training program?

MAJOR McCABE: We, as I mentioned earlier, do train in other parts of Canada, in many parts of Canada. The training that goes on here, although people go into the interior, they do not normally live there all year round. It is a seasonal type of thing. We do not fly all year round. There are certain times when we do not fly. We feel that there is really enough space for everyone to be able to use that area.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is all right with everyone, I think we should hold any further questions about the project until a little later because there are some people here who wish to speak.

Before I ask those people to come forward, I just want to say a few words about this review. As I said at the beginning, the Minister of the Environment has asked this Panel to examine the proposal for military flight training and to make a report to the government whether the Panel thinks that this is acceptable to be approved or whether the effects on the environment would be so serious that it should not be approved.

In order to make this examination of the proposal, the Panel will be asking the Department of National Defence to prepare a bit report called an Environmental Impact Statement. This will be a statement by National Defence saying how it would propose to carry out the project and, at the same time, to deal with any expected impacts on the environment and on the people within the area of the project.

In order to make sure that that Environmental Impact Statement contains all of the correct information and pays attention to all of the important subjects, the Panel will be giving to the Department of National Defence instructions. Those instructions will be contained in a document called Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement.

In August of this year the Panel published a draft of those guidelines. That is, a preliminary unfinished form of the Guidelines document. The Panel is now holding meetings in many communities and this is one of those meetings. The main purpose of these meetings is to listen to what the people there think about this Guidelines document as it is now. When the meetings are over, we will sit down and look at all of the information that we have gathered from all of the people in these communities and we will decide how to make the Guidelines better.

We will present the final form of the Guidelines document to the Department of National Defence in December of this year. National Defence will then begin to write the Environmental Impact Statement and we expect that they would be ready to present the Impact Statement to the Panel sometime late in the spring or early in the summer of 1987.

The Impact Statement will be made public as soon as the Panel receives it so that the people will be able to examine the Impact Statement at the same time as the Panel will be examining it. When that period of examination is finished -- that will take perhaps two or three months -- the Panel will hold more public meetings, except at that time we will call them public hearings. They will be perhaps more important than these meetings that we are holding now because, at that time, we will be asking you and the people in other communities what you think of the Environmental Impact Statement.

When those hearings are finished, the Panel will then write its own report, a report which will be presented to the Minister of the Environment and to the Minister of National Defence. It is intended that the report that the Panel will make to those Ministers will give them a great deal of the information that they will need, so that they can make the decision of whether or not this military flight training should be expanded and whether the Training Centre for NATO should be established at Goose Bay.

Would anybody like to ask me a question about the review process that the Panel is carrying out now? Perhaps there might be questions later on; that would be fine.

Do you have a question now, sir? Go ahead.

MR. BOBBY BARON: I gave my presentation a little earlier but I will have some questions and I would like to stress a few more points.

I wanted to ask a question on the Guidelines, 6.3, number 9, regarding pollutions that might be emitted from these low level flight aircraft. The plants; they might be passing on pollution to the ground where the animals feed on. I am stressing that there be a study conducted on this.

I would also like to know, the bombs that they will be dropping, will they be live bombs or fake ones just for practice? How contaminated can they be and what effect will they have on fungus and other plants growing and, also, the lakes? If this is to go on, I am highly concerned about the contamination that they might have on the fungus and other plants that the wildlife feed on. We want a study done, particularly on this, as part of the various studies that are going to be carried out.

I would like to know if these areas for low level flights would be in the future restricted only to those airplanes. The bombs that they will be using for practicing, if they would be live bombs or if they would be dangerous. The lakes that are going to be affected, the rivers that flow from those lakes are flowing to main rivers that come all the way down here. There are lakes as far as -- lower than the 55th parallel, south of the 55th parallel. Certain lakes, although not many, flow into other lakes that flow into here. If these lakes are contaminated, it will have an effect on the animals here. This we have discussed at the Angovigaq Board meetings and if these lakes are contaminated, then that in turn will eventually reach us through the rivers or the animals that feed on those rivers as well.

The last question I wanted to ask, since Major McCabe did not believe that there would be an effect on hearing and he does not believe that it was caused by these low level flights. Since 1941 there have been flights going on since then and I have heard in the past there are small kids that have been affected and there have been cases where pregnant ladies have premature babies because of these low level flights. When they least expect them, they fly over them and they have premature babies. I believe that these stories are true and I do not believe that they would tell stories just for the hell of it.

So, can you give us the information to these questions I have stressed? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. We will be quite happy to answer as many questions as we can in the time that we have here.

Perhaps this would be a good time to begin hearing from the people of Kangiqsualujjuaq. We have four speakers whose names -- or four presentations that are scheduled to be given here this afternoon. So, I will now ask the first person to come forward, Mr. Bobby Baron of the Angovigaq Wildlife Management.

Tape 11B

---SUBMISSION BY MR. BOBBY BARON:

What I have to say was said a while back. We have been living off this land for many centuries and we try to look after the wildlife that we depend on. Especially in the last few years, we have had to try to have a good management of the wildlife here. We carry out or we implement certain management set-ups for hunters so as to have a sufficient number of wildlife. Various animals, especially caribou, fish, fowl, birds, we try to look

Baron, Sub:

after them and we try not to pollute the land that we use. We know different kinds of things that can have an effect on these animals. If we leave behind anything that might contaminate the animals or the land that the animals live off of -- we try to be careful in this manner. If there is any pollution or any contamination left on the land and if it is caused by the military groups, then they will be affecting our lifestyle.

We know the land and the various rivers that flow into our hunting grounds and we have been hunting off this land for years, even when we were still travelling by dogteam. We know this area very well, it is our hunting grounds. If you base your findings on the studies that have been conducted already -- we have done the same thing. We conduct studies -- we have been conducting studies for several years now and we can see the decline or increase in the number of wildlife. If this project is to go ahead, there has to be a proper and a comprehensive study done to make proper decisions on how to go ahead with this project.

They can use various publications already on-hand, studies already done, and various studies have to be continued as well in order to see the difference on the changes. I believe that you should contact Makivik Corporation which oversees our communities, the well-being of our people as well, and

Baron, Sub:
I feel that DND should not do the study themselves. If they do the study themselves, I do not think I would have too much trust in that. I would ask that they ask the research department of Makivik, who has experience and expertise on doing and conducting studies in this region, and that, too, would give job opportunities to people up here. We do not have different jobs that we can just choose from. It is only when certain things come up that there are some job openings and it would be a benefit to the people of this region if they are asked to do this study.

That is mainly what I wanted to say. Since we do not have too much time at this meeting and from experience I know that better understandings and more discussions can come out from second or third meetings. When you have a meeting for the first time, sometimes it does not come as expected.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. The points that you have raised are certainly very important and we will make sure that we will request in the Guidelines for the Department of National Defence to provide information in the Environmental Impact Statement about those subjects.

Next we will hear from three persons speaking on behalf of the Kangiqsualujjuaq Community Council: Mr. Willie Edmudluk, Mrs. Kitty Annanack, and Mr. Mark Annanack, the Mayor. Will you please make yourselves comfortable at the table.

---SUBMISSION BY WILLIE EDMUDLUK: (Interpretation not available).

---SUBMISSION BY MARK ANNANACK:

When the Assessment Review Panel is going on, up to now you have had public hearings in Kuujuaq and Kangiqsualujjuaq since they are the communities closest to the area and we would like for you to keep us informed on the progress of the review. Keep in mind that the wildlife does not stay to one place or area. The animals, when they are being disturbed, often move to another place.

When I was listening to Major McCabe he was saying that the low level flights try to avoid going too near the communities but there are animals and wildlife that we hunt that do not stay in one area and the calving grounds of the caribou is within the zone. I want you to keep that in mind.

Thank you.

MS KITTY ANNANACK: Since there are other people who have to present their presentations, we will have further questions after they give their presentations. So, we will leave it at this for now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We certainly do promise to keep you well informed about our review and we will think very carefully about everything that you have told us here this afternoon.

The next speaker will be Mr. David

Annanack speaking on behalf of Anguvigaapik.

---SUBMISSION BY BOBBY BARON (On behalf of David Annanack):

Unfortunately, David is not present at this meeting. He was supposed to be here but I am also a Member of the Anguvigaapik from this community.

The main concern that is going to be brought up is the wildlife management in this community. Anguvigaapik has set out various regulations and rules that have to be applied to the different species here in order to have a good management on these animals. So, we want you to be informed of our intentions.

Various projects may be mining or different explorations. We try to set up guidelines for such as well. Our main concern always has been that there be enough wildlife and not to exploit it. So, we also want to be constantly informed on various things that are going on since we are responsible for the well-being of the wildlife and various species that live off the land here.

Since we can already see that there are going to be effects, although it may be small, I would like that all people concerned be kept informed on what is going on. If there is a proper consultation between you and us, then the process will go a lot easier.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The final speaker I have on my list is

Mr. Stanley Annanack speaking on behalf of the Land Holding Corporation.

---SUBMISSION BY STANLEY ANNANACK:

...It seems like we are repeating everything but we all have the same concerns. So, it will be like repetition of what has been said already.

I am the President of Land Holding Corporation here. The wildlife in this area is also our concern. Different species, foxes, otters and different kinds of animals that we hunt go to various places that we cannot even go to. They come to areas very close by and they bring in whatever they find. If they have been affected in any way -- in the past there has been an incident where a wolf attacked a person and that wolf had been in an area that was contaminated. Fortunately, he did not go deep enough to cut him because he was well-dressed.

Things like these also have to be considered. The animals do not know about restrictions to the land, so they might go to areas that are contaminated, attack other animals and pass on whatever disease they have come across. The same with fish and various animals that live off fish. If the fish is contaminated, then it will be passed on.

Sometimes when there is a dry season and no enough rain, some rivers get low. We have worked on rivers just with our hands before because we do not have the necessary tools to work with to make it easier for the fish to go up the river when it

S. Annanack, Sub:

has not been raining enough. So, that is how concerned we are of the animals here.

If something were to happen to different kinds of species in this area, we are not going to be held responsible. So, I want you to be aware of that. Everybody is concerned about this.

It sounds like a reptition of what has been said already but in order for you to understand our concerns, we are doing this. You will have to be aware that we care about the wildlife.

I know in the past there were very few animals left at one point because we were not very good managers then. During that time we used to have dogteams and we have had to kill a lot of caribou in order to feed ourselves and our dogs. Now, a lot of caribou -- the herd has increase by a lot of numbers in the past few years and we do not want anything to affect these animals. We want your help on this, if anything should go wrong.

---SUBMISSION BY LUCAS BILLY ETOK:

My concerns are of the same nature as well. From what I heard earlier, there are two points that I wanted to raise. Major McCabe mentioned that the low level flights try not to go where there are people. I have heard a story that the people in Labrador, although they wanted to go hunting, they were confronted by a military group. That is something I have heard of before.

Etok, Sub:

There was something else. There were questions on animals that have been infected and he said that they do not -- Major McCabe mentioned that there is no evidence as of yet on such effects on these animals or if there is any indication of such things, but we have heard various stories before and this applies to both the land and waters. If the land or water, even if there are no animals at the time, if it is contaminated or if there is pollution, the animals will eventually get it.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Now, I have no more names on my list but we have some time left in the meeting, so I would like to invite anybody who would like to say something to stand at the microphone or come and sit at the table, whichever you prefer. Please give your name before you begin to speak.

You may ask a question of Major McCabe, if you wish, or you may ask me a question or you may say anything that you would like to say about the project or about this review. Please, take your turns and come forward.

MS KITTY ANNANACK: I am not sure who will have to answer this, but I have a question.

We heard that the DND will be conducting the studies. Will they be the ones that will be actually doing the work on the various studies? Who will they ask to do the studies or are they going to do the studies as if no studies have been done already in the past or will they be using other work that has been done before? Will they use the information on hand already from various studies that have been done in the past or will they do the study as if there have been no other studies done before or will they start from scratch...

THE CHAIRMAN: The answer to your question is that they will do both. The Panel will tell National Defence in the Guidelines document what the Panel wants to know. DND will use studies done in the past, that is the results of those studies, and, in addition to that, if new studies need to be done, then National Defence will most likely look for qualified people to carry out those studies. They will hire them and pay them to do the studies and pay all of the costs associated with those studies. So, the answer is, they will do both.

MS KITTY ANNANACK: When I heard of the various studies that are going to be conducted, I thought they were going to start from scratch. I think that since there are a lot of unemployed Inuit, they know the area and that could be also a job opportunity for them.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a good point that you have raised. I think that one important thing that people have come to understand, especially in more recent years, is that if you are going to study something in a local area, whether it is the wildlife or the fish or whether it is the way that people live in the community or how they earn their money, then your best source of information is the people who actually live in that area. They are the people who live there and have lived there for a long time and they are the people who know best what is going on in their community and on the land which they have used.

So, we feel that it is very important in any study that is going to be done for this Environmental Impact Statement to make sure that National Defence or whoever National Defence might hire to do studies, those people would go into the communities and talk to the people who live there, to learn from their experience and to learn from their knowledge. Certainly, in some cases, it might be a very good idea to employ some of the local people in the course of carrying out this studies. So, I thank you for your suggestion.

Would somebody else like to speak? Would you please give us your names?

MR. SIMEONIE BARON: Simeonie Baron.

MR. WILLIE ANNANACK: Willie Annanack.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. S. BARON: We are also a Member of the Anguvigaapik in this community and we would also like to voice our concerns regarding wildlife, since

S. Baron, Sub.

we are the managers and we live off these wildlife.

Regarding these airplanes that will be flying at low levels, when we hear of them we are highly concerned about the effect they are going to have on the land, the disturbance of the animals. We are aware that it should not be disturbed too much by the outside people. There is training required and the Government of Canada, I am sure, wants a good training. We may not have too much influence on the actual training but, if there is a disturbance of the animals and if there is an effect on the animals here, the caribou or other species, we have heard that there -- I have seen reports that in the region there are Indians living, there are Indian tribes. They are saying that there used to be a lot of caribou but there are not that many any more and they depend on these animals that they live on. They are starting to come further up north and the animals are running away from the noise. We feel that if they get any closer to this area, the animals we live off on this land may be scared away as well and they will go elsewhere.

The emission from the jets does not go just out into outerspace, it will eventually fall down to the ground. When it rains it will fall down to the ground because it does not disappear out into thin air. Even if it does not reach the ground right away, with the sky moving all the time and different things going on up there, it will eventually fall down to the ground when it rains. If it does have an effect on the ground and the fauna and various plants that caribou feed on, it will have an effect on these animals and I want this to be considered and that these studies be done.

Now economic development appears with the caribou and, if that is affected, then all these outfitting camps will also be affected. You will see reports that the caribou used to be in the vicinity or in the area of Davis Inlet, near Nain and Goose Bay and they tell us there is no longer that many caribou. In the past six years that has been happening.

We hear of these low level flights that go as low as 50 feet. Up here we can see jets that are flying very high but still we can hear them and I can just imagine what it is like when they are flying 50 feet high. That can have an affect on the water when they are flying that low over the lakes. There are various things that the fish feed on in the lakes and we cannot see that with the naked eye but they are having an affect on the food that the fish live on.

I would like all of this to be considered. Thank you.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WILLIE ANNANACK: There is vegetation that grows down south, they have agriculture, and up here the natural foods or plants that grow here take a lot longer than what grows down south because this is the north. They grow very slowly and I want you to consider that it takes a long time to replace what is affected. It takes a while for something that is contaminated to have any effect. Some of them may have a long range effect. I know for a fact that there cannot be instant compensation for these and I want you also to be aware of that. Thank you.

MR. S. BARON: If this project is to go ahead and if the proposal is accepted -- if this is not going to be carried out in Turkey and if it is to be held in Canada, there are going to be 250 flights per day and that is a lot of flights in one day. I know that Canada is not a rich country. If, for any reason, there was a mistake in their training and if there would be an accident in this region, according to the Agreement we have land agreed upon. There is Category 2 and 3 lands. If there would be an accident for any reason at all, how would it be dealt with?

MR. W. ANNANACK: I know everybody is trying to control this very well and trying to have a well managed project but since they are humans as well, anybody can make a mistake. Although they say they are not going to use real bombs, what exactly are they going to be using? What kind of equipment are they going to us for these training programs for target practice and what effect would they have on the land? We would like to be informed on what exactly they are going to be using.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that Major McCabe might be able to provide some information on the kinds of practice weapons that might be used right now. I do not believe there would be time enough to go into the possible effects of those but that is something that we would be examining in our review.

Major, would you care to say something about the types of weapons that might be used?

MAJOR McCABE: Very briefly, the types of weapons that are used right now -- we do have one small area for practice weapons, as we call them. The weapons that are used are made of metal or concrete, they have no explosives in them and they have no contaminants, no chemicals or anything like that at all. All it does is comes off the airplane and hits the ground. Some of them have a little smoke charge in them, a little puff of smoke comes off to show where it hit the ground but there is no danger of fires or contamination or anything from these weapons.

If the NATO Centre comes, there may be a requirement to use live weapons. These are not used all over the place. Very, very strict requirements or criteria are in place to establish these kinds of areas to use live weapons. They are very strictly controlled and they are very small. We have areas, as I mentioned, in other parts of Canada where we do this kind of training. Those kinds of weapons -- some of them do explode. So, damage, if you like, can be caused to just the ground itself. The normal place we pick to try to do that is in a very sandy area, an area where there is no real vegetation or, particularly, no wildlife around.

One of our big training bases is in Alberta, in the Town of Cold Lake. We use many of these weapons on the land and, even in one very large lake, we test many kinds of weapons. Just for your information, there are many, many animals on the ranges that live there and they are not affected by these weapons. That lake I mentioned happens to have some of the best fishing in the area. So, it is that kind of thing that makes us feel that the sort of activity that we are doing in Labrador will not have any major harmful effects on the animals and on the plants.

That is the sort of thing, as we said before, that will be studied; to make sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

We still have some time left. So, I would ask you to come forward if you have a question you would like to ask.

Tape 12B

Would you please give your name?

MS CHRISTINA BARON: Christina Baron of Kangiqsualujjuaq, a Member of the Co-op Board. All these things have been talked about are understandable. What I am concerned about is for the future, since we do not have agriculture up north and what we buy from the store has to come up here by ship or by plane. So, it is very expensive to buy food from the stores and a lot of people are not employed, so they have to depend on the wildlife because they cannot afford everything that can be provided at the store.

If, in the future, for whatever reason, the animals are affected after this project has been going on, I want you to be aware that you have to think of the people that have to buy food from the stores.

MR. TOMMY EMUK: My name is Tommy Emuk. I would like to say a few things to a Member of the Education Committee here and I thank you people for coming to this community to talk about this project. Everything that has been said is true and this directly affects the education system as well. The Education Committee here is concerned as well and, if in the future you come here again, we would like to be given an opportunity to voice our concerns as well.

In regard to the low level flights, when I am out hunting there have been a number of times that I have seen such planes. Everything that has been brought to your attention is true and next time you travel up here I ask that the Education Committee of this community be given a chance to voice their concerns as well for your next meetings in the future.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. We will think carefully about what you have said.

The next speaker, please?

MR. W. ANNANACK: What I will be

talking about is from the past when Major McCabe was talking about the hearing impaired. Although that was discussed earlier, I would like to get back to it a bit regarding the studied on hearing impaired.

I know that Inuit always have a hearing problem, especially the babies or the very young people. That is a fact among the Inuit. I know of various animals that from time to time have diseases. If something were to happen because of their hearing, it would have a diverse effect on the herd. Although they are saying it is not going to be a direct effect on the herd, there is no guarantees that there would not be any diverse effect on these animals.

We try to manage our wildlife as best we can and I want the outside people to be well aware of that and that they be concerned about these animals as well. If the animals hear a loud noise they never heard before or a certain smell that they never experienced before, it is going to have some kind of effect on them. We do not have any agriculture up here or farms and we have to depend on these wildlife that go anywhere they want to.

If you go to the store here and you look at the price of a certain food, I know you would be amazed at the difference of price that you get down south and the price of food we get up here. We live off of these animals and, if we need some money, we depend on the wildlife as well. Especially for the hunters that do not have jobs, they depend on these animals.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. BOBBY BARON: It is me, again, Bobby Baron. What I am really concerned about, since it touches upon the north 55th, is that zone that has been marked on the map is on the calving area of the George River herd. Salmon that we fish in this river go up the river and, if there is any kind of pollution or contamination of the lakes, these salmon might be affected. Looking at the map, it is in the area of where the salmon go up the river.

I am wondering if they could move that zone a bit further south. We are very concerned about the animals that may be contaminated. If they are, then we are affected. It is going to alter our way of life, our lifestyle if it happens. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

We still have a few more minutes if anybody else would like to speak. It may be a long time before we come back here again, perhaps one year. So, if you think you would like to say something, then we would like to hear it now.

Mr. Stewart would like to speak to you.

MR. DON STEWART: Without taking too much time, I am rather interested in hearing from one of the gentleman here who is experienced in the hunting.

Is it customary for you to go out and

camp out or do you hunt from here and come back at night? If there is such a thing as an average, how far into the interior do you go to do the hunting; is it so many hours by skidoo or is it 50 miles or 100 miles? Just to give me some feel for -- particularly with respect to the caribou.

MR. B. BARON: Somebody else might comment on this, too, but sometimes we have to go far, up to 100 miles or more. When we go trapping, we even go further. Since the caribou are often very close by in the recent years, we do not have to go very far when we go hunting caribou. But we have to go hunting for other species. For trapping, especially, we have to go 100 miles or more. We have to go sometimes for a week at a time or sometimes less. It depends on what kind of animal we are hunting. Sometimes the animals are closer, sometimes they are very far. When there is no animals in one area, we have to move to another area. So, it varies.

MR. STEWART: Do you have any contact in your hunting and trapping with the Montagnais or the Naskapis?

MR. B. BARON: In the recent years we have never really met them but our ancestors, our fathers, our grandfathers, used to meet them in the past when they had to go far up the George River to go hunting. But in recent years we have not been meeting them much. The lifestyle is changing in that way, also.

MR. STEWART: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The time has almost come now to close our meeting. Perhaps I could offer one last invitation to somebody to speak, if they would like to.

MR. B. BARON: Since our scheduled meeting is coming to an end, would you please inform us on the process of your work and send us any information you may have or, if you want more information from us, you are free to contact us.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We certainly do promise to keep you informed all the way through this review process now that we have come to know some of you people here in the community. We have established contacts here and we will continue to keep you informed.

Before closing the meeting, I would like to say that we are very happy that we have come here. You have made us feel very welcome. For some of us, this is the first time that we have ever been in Kangiqsualujjuaq; for others, I know it is not the first time they have been here. I am sure I speak for everyone on the Panel when I say that we are looking forward to the next time when we might come and meet you all again and talk to you some more about the project.

I would like to thank you all for coming to meet with us. I would like to especially thank all of you who have come up and spoken to us. I would like to thank the people who have provided us with the tables and the chairs and all of the other things that we needed to carry on this meeting.

I would like to thank, of course, our Secretariat, the two gentlemen that I introduced to you earlier. I would like to thank our Court Reporter sitting over at the table near the wall. I would like to thank our audio technician at the back of the room and, of course, our very capable interpreter.

So, again, thank you all very much and goodbye. I would now turn the meeting over to the Mayor.

MR. MARK ANNANACK: Thank you.

We have heard of your coming to this community a few months in advance and have been provided with various reports or pamphlets. This has helped us a lot and we now have more information on the plans of NATO and the on-going project that is going on in Canada already and the proposal that they have tabled. We appreciate the information provided to us and I thank you people, Members of the Panel, for visiting us in this community.

In the future, if you need any information, you are free to call me in my office or anybody in our office.

I would like to say also that the Naskapis of Schefferville -- we would like to have contact with them also, since they are closer to the project itself. We could talk to them on the phone as well and pass on various information. Since they are around the river up here, the George River, they are close to the project as well. We hope to have good communication between all of us concerned.

We would appreciate any written reports that you may have for our information.

On behalf of the people here and everybody else in the community who are not at this meeting at the moment, I thank you for informing us and coming to this community. Thank you.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned.

Volume

12

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	MONTREAL	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 20, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	12	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Place Dupuis, Montreal

DATE: October 20, 1986.

VOLUME: 12

INDEX

	Page No.
Opening Remarks by Mr. D. H. Barnes	1083
Introduction by Major D. McCabe	1089

QUESTIONS AND/OR SUBMISSIONS BY:

John Kinlock	1201
Michel Yergeau	1203
Mr. Louis O'Neill	1214
Madame Anne Claret	1225
Edmund Malec	1228
Paul Charest	1231
Jacques Coster	1239
Bernard Cléry	1244
Louis Gilles Francoeur	1261
René Boudreau	1263
Guy Bellefleur	1268
Yves Pagé	1275
Gaétan Roberge	1289
Alain Méthot	1297
Henry Shouse	1305
Councillor Brett	1317
Conrad Sioui	1325
Danny Gaspe	1331
Gérald McKenzie	1351
Christian Boulais	1355
Jean Philippe Waaub	1362
Erik Poole	1378

-o0o-

---Upon commencing at 2:00 P.M.

LE PRESIDENT: Mesdames et messieurs, mon nom est David Barnes et je suis président de cette Commission d'évaluation environnementale sur les activités militaires au-dessus du Québec et du Labrador.

Je vous remercie tous d'être ici présents aujourd'hui. Plusieurs des membres de cette Commission sont plus à l'aise en anglais, j'entends donc présider cette rencontre publique en anglais en comptant sur toute l'assistance du service de traduction simultanée.

Good afternoon. This Panel is presently in the midst of a series of public meetings, which is one of the first stages of this environmental review. We are pleased to be in Montréal today and we thank all of you for coming.

I will now introduce to you the other members of the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table, to your left, is seated Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of a region of NORAD, which included responsibility for training, equipping, maintaining and deployed of the United States and Canadian Air Defence Forces in NORAD. Mr. Stewart brings to the Panel his expertise concerning military aircraft and their operations.

Next to Mr. Stewart is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who lives in St. John's. Mr. Northcott has had extensive experience with wildlife in Newfoundland and Labrador; formally an employee of the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland. He is now Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resource questions.

Next to him is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in the town of Makkovik, Labrador, where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill brings to the Panel a wealth of knowledge about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

To my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Québec, where he has been quite active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and has been administrative director of Les Galeries Montagnais, a shopping centre in Sept-Iles. Prior to his retirement, Mr. Jourdain worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada for 20 years.

Finally, at the other end of the table is Doctor Paul Wilkinson. Doctor Wilkinson lives in Montréal where he operates a consulting firm. He is a biologist who works extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Québec. He has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapi.

I am employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa, where, when I am not carrying on Panel duties, I am Director for the Atlantic Region for the office. I have been there for about one year now prior to which I was employed with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the Environment Department.

A few words about procedure for the

meeting this afternoon and this evening. We have received quite a large number of registrations, and, in particular, certain people have indicated that they wish to speak this afternoon rather than this evening, so we are going to attempt to go as far as possible in their wishes. Because of the large number of speakers we are going to limit any presentation from any individual or from a group as a whole to a maximum time of 20 minutes. This will allow a little time after each presentation for a few questions if there are such, and if we save enough time here and there, five minutes here; five minutes there, perhaps we may be able to have enough time to have a coffee break this afternoon and one this evening. We are prepared to extend the advertised hours of the meetings. For example: We are prepared to go until 5:30 this afternoon rather than 5:00 o'clock, and tonight we are prepared to go beyond 10:00 o'clock; perhaps, as much as one hour and that is until 11:00 o'clock, if necessary. I hope that all of the speakers will find it possible to comply with this request to limit their presentations. If any speaker has come with a lengthy written presentation, then we would ask that you present it in summary form and either present the entire paper to us at this time or send it in the mail as quickly as possible.

We have set October 31st as the deadline date for receiving written comments on the

6

draft guidelines, which, of course, is the main purpose of this series of meetings.

I would like to briefly outline the review for those of you who may not be familiar with the environmental assessment process. In February of 1986, the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment describing the proposal that is under review and asking the Minister to initiate a public review under the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process. The Minister did, indeed, do that; appointing a Panel in July of this year and issuing to this Panel a mandate contained in a document called "terms of reference", which has been made public.

The Panel met shortly afterwards and after examining a great deal of information presented to it and deliberating on the basis of its own expertise, the Panel issued a document called "Draft Guidelines" for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. That Draft Guideline was published in August of this year and since that time has been out in the public domain for review and comment, and, as I said a few moments ago, we are now holding this series of meetings, which began in September and will end at the end of October, to receive comment on that Draft Guidelines document.

After the meetings are over, the

Panel will look at all the information coming in from the transcripts of the meetings and in presentations, which we are receiving, and will finalize the document.

We expect to be able to deliver the final form of the guidelines to the Department of National Defence sometime in December of this year; as early as possible. That will begin the process of the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement, which we are expecting to be complete sometime in the late spring or early summer of 1987.

As soon as it is delivered to the Panel, the Environmental Impact Statement will be made public so that it will be available to the public for review for a period of perhaps of two or three months at the same time as the Panel is reviewing it. When the Panel is satisfied that the impact statement is satisfactory, that it complies with the requirements of the guidelines document, the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings to discuss the Project. As we foresee it now, the most likely time for those hearings to be held is in the fall of 1987.

Following the hearings, the Panel will prepare its own report based on its evaluation of the impact statement and based on whatever information may have been presented to it by that time by departments of government or by the public.

The Panel expects to be able to present its report to the Minister of Environment and the Minister of National Defence sometime late in 1987 or early in 1988.

That then is a brief outline of the review. It is customary in all public meetings of this sort for the Panel to invite to the meeting a representative of the proponent to briefly outline the Project, or proposal under review, and to answer questions on the nature of the Project, which may come forward from the audience. In accordance with that then, today we have invited Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence, who will go to the table at the side of the room I believe now and briefly present the Project and answer any questions which you may have. Major McCabe.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen:

By way of introduction, I would like to give a bit of my background and involvement to this Project. I spent the first two years of my career in the military at Goose Bay as an Air Traffic Controller and I have recent experience as a Fighter Pilot. For the past two years in Ottawa, I have been the Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. This summer I became involved with all future military planning for the airfield and I currently work in the Directorate of Air Plans.

Goose Bay Airport was constructed in 1941 as a staging base for aircraft transitting to Europe to support the war effort. Since that time the airfield has seen a constant military presence, albeit at varying levels of activity. During the peak years nearly 12,000 military personnel and their families lived at the airfield. The United States Airforce maintained a force of interceptor aircraft for air defence purposes and a large fleet of air refuelling aircraft to support the strategic air command long range bombers.

The Royal Airforce flew Vulcan bombers on low level navigation training flights from the late fifties until 1984, at which time the new Tornado aircraft replaced the aging Vulcan. The Royal Airforce has also used, during recent years, Phantoms, Harriers, Bucanneers and Jaguars. Since 1980, there has been a noticeable increase in military flying, specifically low-level flying.

With the initial interest shown at that time by the German Airforce in commencing flying operations at Goose Bay, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effects of increased low-flying activity, which also included consideration of the requirement for practice target ranges.

This evaluation was limited to a desk

study of existing data relating to such activities and was not intended to be an in-depth on-site study by specialists.

The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environmental would be negligible but, as existing data on caribou were inconclusive, it was recommended that a possibility of avoidance of the animals be established. In order to co-ordinate and control all local military flying in a safe and efficient manner, a Military Co-ordination Centre was established in 1984. Manned by Canadian Forces personnel, the Military Co-ordination Centre handles all local military flight plans and advises aircrew on a daily basis of local restrictions such as caribou concentrations and active fishing and hunting camps, when these are known.

The northern training area has been subdivided into three sections in order that it can be closed off to avoid caribou migrations and calving areas as required. As well, known occupied camps are marked on maps for the aircrew with a five-mile diameter circle as areas to be avoided by low-flying aircraft.

Currently there are four military users at Goose Bay, all of which are signators to a ten-year multi-national Memorandum of Understanding signed in February of this year. This Agreement covers all military flying activity at Goose Bay.

The United States Airforce has a small detachment of personnel whose primary role is to service transient transport aircraft on their way to and from Europe. The Canadian Forces operate the long range air defence radar and the air traffic control radar facilities, provide transient servicing to Canadian military itinerant aircraft and, as of March of this year, operate three rescue helicopters from Goose Bay on a permanent basis.

In 1988, the Canadian Forces will establish a deployed operating base at Goose Bay consisting of four CF-18 aircraft in a sovereignty and air defence role.

The Royal Airforce conducts low-level flying training this year by using nine Tornado aircraft which were kept at the airfield for the flying season.

The German Airforce conducts similar training using a variety of aircraft such as F-4 Phantoms, Alpha Jets, and Tornados, with usually about 20 aircraft on site at any one time.

As well as practicing low-level navigation and tactical manoeuvring, these aircraft occasionally use the practice target range located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This range is in an open sandy area previously burned over by a forest fire. It is eight miles or approximately

13 kilometres in diameter and is clearly marked with signs printed in four languages. Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range and some of these devices have a small smoke charge in them to indicate impact point. There are no plans at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Another site is currently being examined in the northern training area to establish a second practice range, but no formal approval has been given to date.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, the current users have indicated a desire to expand their operations somewhat over the next few years. As well, Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing a long term training program at Goose Bay. The Netherlands' activity rate, incidentally, is included in the scope of this FEARO process.

The Royal Netherlands Airforce hopes to conduct a half season training program in 1987 using 10 to 12 F-16 fighters and approximately 120 personnel.

The expanded program will continue to be oriented towards low-level flying with some night and poor weather flying being done as required. These last two activities are for training aircrew in the use of the terrain-following radar equipment which is currently installed in the Tornado aircraft.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which is just a fancy name for a training school for military aircraft. This Project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught the public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity.

Before I provide details of this proposal, let me give a very brief background to the NATO training centre Project. Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO airforces is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe, with a concentration over West Germany. Each year approximately 538,000 flights are flown over Germany alone at day and night; a country with 63 million people. About 110,000 of these flights are in the low-level regime. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities.

Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well trained conventional airforce, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which could provide a full spectrum of training for all NATO aircrews. Nations were asked at the time for their training requirements and based on these statistics a NATO-appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum or ideal facility to cater to all of these training requirements. As the working group was instructed that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge, full-scope centre was proposed.

The scope of the training centre was detailed in a Phase I Report, as it is called; submitted to NATO in June, 1983. Two countries have offered potential sites for the centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and Turkey has offered Konya Air Base. Site surveys were conducted of each site last year and an initial recommendation has been submitted by the working group.

NATO is expected to decide on selection of the most suitable site by December of this year. Following that selection, the fourth phase will then commence. Negotiations and detailed planning and design will begin with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the design.

This planning phase is due to be completed by December, 1988. During the phase if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered, then the alternate site would be considered.

The training centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990s, barring any major delays.

The Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre Project in its optimum full scope would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting about 200 sorties a day for 20-two-week detachments every year; in other words, for about a 40-week training period a year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties every two weeks by transport aircraft to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 aircrew and 1,300 ground personnel transitting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on two or three year postings to the area many of them could be expected to bring their families; thus, further swelling the population by 1,000-1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer-products stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities, such as the construction of a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the existing fuel storage and

and delivery system. A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system, which is currently under construction. As far as types of training activities which would be carried out, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical optimum model for this centre.

As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. It suffices to say, that as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several training activities, depending on their dedicated roles. These might be low-level tactical navigation reconnaissance; air combat training at medium to high altitudes, including supersonic flight; electronic warfare training using onboard and ground-based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery, ideally looking for four ranges similar to the one that exists today; live weapons delivery with an optimum of three ranges being required; tactical air support of maritime operations, which is a fancy term for anti-shipping; and flag-type exercise, involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles, all flying at the same time in support of each other.

Several of these requirements are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes a sea range, which is merely an area where aircraft conduct tactical manoeuvres against military shipping: Naval vessels. From time to time they might also fire weapons at targets towed by the ships.

Several such sea ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range, as an optional item. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile, or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it is established at all. Since the initial statement of requirements for live weapons' ranges resulting in the 1983 report, technology had advanced to the stage that there is now a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets on the ground without any weapons coming off the aircraft.

This system known as a "no-drop bomb-scoring system" has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost-savings due to weapons expenditure reductions. Such a system would very likely be part of the NATO training complex.

Should a live weapons' area still be required, however, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a Project are directly proportional to the scope of the Project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO Project. With reference to the latter, only a full-scope optimum facility was examined, as was defined in the Phase I Report. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative as any down-sizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular daily operational phase. During its site survey last year, the NATO working group examined the town of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville as possible alternate airfield locations.

Alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergency or for weather diversion, or, they could also be used to launch a small number of aircraft to act in an adversary role during the training requirements. Such utilization would require some upgrading of facilities at these sites such as runway extensions, refuelling systems, and

(Page 1200 follows...)

possibly some accommodations. The working group is focusing their attention on locating the NATO training centre over the existing northern training area. The southern area, as it exists right now, would still be used for low-level flying training.

In conclusion I must emphasize that expansion proposals, which have been discussed and studied to date are based on the assumption that a full-scale training centre would be constructed. However, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises and military programs such as these are not exempt. As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding profiles are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, for your time, and I certainly will be happy to take any questions at this time pertaining to my presentation or to the proposals under review, and also I will be available for questions during any breaks we have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. If anyone has a question to ask at this time or at any other time we would ask you to use one of the two microphones on the floor and to clearly state your name for the record before you ask your question or make your statement.

MR. JOHN KIN : My name is John Kinlock and I have an information question I would like to ask, which is: In your list of countries that you listed that have trained or are presently training in Goose Bay you did not mention Belgium. Has not Belgium, in fact, been there this summer?

MAJOR McCABE: The countries I mentioned that are conducting training are conducting training on a regular basis. The Belgiums and the Dutch, indeed, did conduct a two-week training exercise in Goose Bay this summer. This was on their return journey from the Red Flag exercise in the United States. The Dutch, obviously, because they already have an interest in Goose Bay for next year, were wanting to examine the facilities more closely but the Belgiques were there for that period only and have not extended any further interest to the Canadian Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions?

If not then, thank you very much, Major McCabe. As the Major has indicated, he would be quite welcome to entertain questions privately at any other time during a break in the meeting or between sessions.

The lists of speakers for this afternoon and tonight have been posted at the back of the room. Before going to our first scheduled speaker the Panel has received a request from an unscheduled speaker to make a five-minute presentation of a special nature to the Panel. We have aceded to that request. Our speaker is Mr. Michel Yergeau.

PAR Me YERGEAU: Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président. Je vais m'adresser à la Commission en français.

Comme vous l'avez indiqué, mon nom est Michel Yergeau, je suis un avocat qui s'intéresse tout particulièrement, dans sa pratique, aux questions de protection de l'environnement et de droit de l'environnement. Je suis avocat au sein de la firme Pouliot, Mercure, Lebel et Associés.

Je parle cet après-midi au nom de mes clients dont je donne la liste qui font partie de la Coalition québécoise de l'Environnement et qui sont la Fédération québécoise de la Faune, la Société pour vaincre la pollution, la S.V.P., Green Peace, l'Union québécoise pour la conservation de la nature, l'Association québécoise de lutte contre les pluies acides, l'Association québécoise des techniciens et techniciennes en aménagement cynégétique et halieutique, l'Association des Biologistes du Québec et l'Association des Pourvoyeurs.

M'ont permis aussi de parler en leur nom: La Ligue des Droits et Libertés, la Confédération des Syndicats nationaux, la Fédération des Travailleurs du Québec, la C.E.Q. Donc, des groupes qui ne sont pas nécessairement versés dans les questions de protection de l'environnement mais qui n'en sont pas moins intéressés pour autant.

Les premiers groupes étant évidemment des groupes environnementaux.

Nous avions formulé, dans une lettre que nous adressions au nom de nos clients, à monsieur Carol Martin le secrétaire exécutif du Bureau fédéral le deux (2) septembre, une demande pour que des audiences de cette Commission se tiennent à Montréal puisque des groupes intéressés à la protection de l'environnement voulaient se faire entendre devant vous.

Par télex que nous avons envoyé à monsieur Martin vendredi et par une lettre confirmant, envoyée par messager le jour-même, nous avons formulé ou j'ai formulé, au nom de mes clients, une demande pour que la présente audience soit remise à la fin du mois de novembre ou au début du mois de décembre.

Les raisons en sont les suivantes: C'est que, effectivement, des audiences ont été annoncées il y a maintenant un peu plus de deux (2) semaines à Montréal, sauf que force m'est de constater qu'il y a eu des problèmes à faire circuler l'information et que j'ai été à même de constater, lors d'une réunion de travail qui s'est tenue mercredi dernier, que les groupes, tant les groupes spécialisés en environnement que les autres groupes présents à cette réunion ne connaissaient pas quel était l'objectif exact de cette séance que vous tenez aujourd'hui, qu'ils ne connaissaient pas la nature du projet, exacte, et qu'ils n'avaient pas encore pris connaissance de la proposition de lignes directrices préparées par cette Commission et datées du mois d'août mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six (1986).

Fort de ceci, on m'a donné mandat de présenter la demande de remise que je vous adressais vendredi dernier. Non pas pour ralentir les travaux de la Commission, mais pour aider la Commission dans son travail.

Je me permettrai de parler de moi-même pendant quelques secondes pour me présenter.

J'ai été pendant cinq (5) ans, avant de revenir à la pratique du droit dans le domaine de l'environnement, j'ai été pendant cinq (5) ans le vice-président du Bureau d'Audiences publiques sur l'Environnement, soit le pendant québécois du Bureau fédéral.

Je suis retourné à la pratique et ma pratique porte essentiellement sur des questions d'environnement et d'aménagement.

Je suis aussi membre du Comité consultatif sur l'Environnement d'Hydro-Québec. Membre de l'Association des Conseillers en Environnement et membre de l'exécutif de cette Association, procureur et conseiller juridique auprès de la Coalition québécoise pour l'Environnement.

Je compte aussi parmi mes clients de nombreuses associations, des compagnies qui ont des problèmes d'environnement et de nombreuses firmes d'experts conseil dans le domaine de l'environnement.

Ma spécialité à l'intérieur de la spécialité sont les questions de déchets, de bruit et d'audiences publiques.

J'ai eu la chance, d'ailleurs, sous ce dernier chef, d'agir à titre de conseil auprès des gouvernements d'Alberta, d'Ontario et du Nouveau-Brunswick pour la mise en place d'un certain nombre de procédures d'audience.

C'est donc un peu pour cette raison qu'on m'a demandé de présenter cette demande.

Or, je sais par expérience, comme je le disais avant de faire ce petit préambule et avoir grossièrement parlé de moi-même, j'en conviens, j'ai été maintes fois à même de constater qu'une étude d'impact ne valait jamais plus que la qualité des lignes directrices qu'on fournissait à un promoteur pour sa préparation.

Même si mes clients ont eu peu de temps pour faire le travail que la Commission attend d'eux, nous sommes en mesure de considérer que les lignes directrices ou la proposition qui a déjà été déposée, pour intéressante qu'elle soit, est incomplète et qu'elle demande un sérieux travail de réflexion, d'addition et de correction.

Ce travail ne peut pas se faire en deux (2) semaines, quand on connaît un peu le mode de fonctionnement des groupes spécialisés.

Tous les gens qui font partie de ces groupes sont des bénévoles, des gens qui ont déjà leurs activités, leur travail le jour. Et qui doivent se réunir et il est absolument impossible de tenir plus qu'une réunion par semaine sur un sujet donné, puisque ces gens sont déjà pressés de réunions pour d'autres dossiers.

Il n'a donc pas été possible de faire le travail de préparation qui serait adéquat pour permettre de commenter et de critiquer les lignes directrices.

De fait, nous sommes rassemblés aujourd'hui pour participer à cette étape préliminaire d'une audience qui reste à faire lorsque l'étude d'impact aura été préparée, mais nous sommes ici pour aider la Commission à formuler les lignes directrices les plus pertinentes possibles dans un sujet remarquablement complexe.

C'est donc d'abord et avant tout par un souci de collaborer le plus pleinement possible à l'aspect directement environnemental du dossier, qui est l'objet de votre compétence présentement, que nous avons formulé cette demande de remise.

Nous considérons qu'il serait extrêmement dommageable que l'étude d'impact soit préparée sans que les groupes que nous représentons aient eu l'occasion de se faire entendre oralement devant cette Commission.

Nous avons écarté la proposition que vous nous avez déjà faite de soumettre des notes écrites. Nous soumettrons éventuellement des notes écrites, mais nous considérons que l'aspect dynamique d'un forum comme celui-ci est au moins aussi important que les notes que nous pouvons déposer.

Il est nécessaire que les groupes qui déposent des recommandations ou des propositions devant cette Commission puissent non seulement se faire entendre, mais soient aussi entendus par les autres groupes intéressés, de façon à ce que les propositions des uns puissent servir au travail des autres et que les propositions formulées par les uns puissent aussi être commentées par les autres. C'est ça l'aspect dynamique d'une audience.

Et c'est de cet aspect dont nous

voulons ou dont nos clients veulent bénéficier.

Donc, messieurs, nous estimons notre demande bien fondée, tout à fait conforme d'ailleurs à l'article vingt-sept (27) du décret sur les lignes directrices visant le processus d'évaluation et d'examen en matière d'environnement, qui dit que les audiences d'une commission sont des audiences publiques qui sont menées de manière informelle, suivant des règles déterminées mais non judiciaires.

Nous estimons que la demande qui est faite au nom de douze (12) groupes qui sont d'une importance non négligeable au Québec justifient notre demande et permettent amplement à cette Commission de fixer une nouvelle date pour la tenue de cette audience, date que nous demandons après le vingt-cinq (25) novembre mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six (1986).

Je vous remercie de votre attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Yergeau. You will understand that your requests arrived only Friday of last week, which was very short notice relative to the time of this meeting. The Panel has met and has considered your request and we regret that we are not able to respond positively to it.

The Panel issued a set of procedural documents in August of this year in which we set out the manner in which the review was to be conducted. It was stated quite clearly that there would be at least 30 days allowed for the examination of guidelines. These guidelines have been available since August. We stated further, that at least 21 days notice would be given prior to any public meeting and we have met that requirement relative to this meeting.

Therefore, we feel that the groups which you represent have been given as fair a chance as anyone else to participate in this meeting and to provide us with comments on the Draft Guidelines. The Panel wishes to be able to issue the guidelines in final form early in December of this year, so it is necessary for us to have all comments in our hands either through these meetings or by mail by the end of October. While we understand that this may be a second-best opportunity from the point of view of your clients, we will welcome their written comments by the end of October and we will certainly give them due consideration when the Panel meets in November to finalize the guidelines.

Once again, I thank you for your presentation but we are unable to meet your request.

PAR Me YERGEAU: Monsieur le Président, je vous demande la parole pendant encore trente (30) secondes, s'il vous plaît.

Je suis évidemment déçu du refus de la Commission. Je trouve que la Commission fait preuve d'une bien grande rigueur et, avec beaucoup de respect, j'estime qu'elle sous-estime l'ampleur du travail qu'elle demande aux groupes.

Je conteste, avec beaucoup de respect, l'affirmation à l'effet que les groupes que je représente étaient au courant de la nature des propositions de ligne directrice depuis le mois d'août.

Il n'y avait pas d'audience prévue à Montréal, non plus qu'à St-John, ce n'est que dernièrement que cette décision a été prise.

Il était impensable que des groupes, même qui oeuvrent au niveau de l'ensemble du territoire du Québec, puissent participer aux audiences de La Romaine ou de Schefferville compte tenu des frais que cela représente, des déplacements que cela représente.

Vous avez consenti à venir à Montréal pour les entendre et voilà que vous leur refusez le temps de préparation qu'ils considèrent adéquat et qu'ils sont les meilleurs juges pour apprécier.

J'estime que la Commission est

extrêmement pressée que de toute façon, sans vouloir faire de mauvaise blague, une remise permettrait peut-être au ministère de la Défense nationale de trouver un interlocuteur francophone pour tenir des audiences à Montréal.

Je crois que la Commission pourrait encore réviser sa décision, tenir une partie des auditions aujourd'hui, sans doute, mais poursuivre ces audiences, tel que demandé, à la fin du mois de novembre, ce qui ne retarderait que de peu le travail de la Commission.

J'ai de la difficulté à comprendre pourquoi la Commission se montre aussi pressée d'en finir avec cette étape absolument cruciale à la préparation d'un dossier adéquat de la part des promoteurs.

Je vous remercie beaucoup de votre attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now commence the list of scheduled speakers as posted; again, reminding you of the necessity to keep the presentations to a maximum of 20 minutes. Now, I will be watching this quite closely, and as you approach the end of your allotted time I will attempt to discreetly make you aware of that fact.

Our first speaker for this afternoon is Mr. O'Neill speaking on behalf of Le Groupe de recherches sur la paix, Université de Laval.

PAR MONSIEUR O'NEILL: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les membres de la Commission, alors je viens ici aujourd'hui à titre de membre et coordonnateur du Groupe de recherche sur la paix de l'Université Laval, c'est une petite équipe pluridisciplinaire, formée d'un certain nombre de professeurs et d'étudiants et qui s'intéresse à diverses questions reliées à la paix, à la guerre, à la course aux armements et et caetera.

Et nous avons titré ainsi notre communication: "Vols à basse altitude: La question préalable". C'est la question que nous voulons poser ici.

Monsieur le Président, la Commission d'évaluation environnementale du gouvernement du Canada a accepté d'étudier l'impact écologique, humain et social des vols d'entraînement à basse altitude effectués selon des ententes bilatérales conclues par le gouvernement du Canada avec certains de ses alliés de l'OTAN. Elle s'interroge également sur les conséquences de l'exploitation d'un centre d'entraînement réservé aux forces aériennes de l'OTAN à Goose Bay.

Les audiences publiques qui alimentent cette étude fournissent l'occasion d'amorcer un débat public sur la militarisation du Nord. Il convient de remercier la Commission d'avoir ainsi rendu ce débat possible et je me permets de souhaiter que la Commission continue dans ce sens, en trouvant le moyen d'organiser d'autres audiences pour cette douzaine de groupes dont le porte-parole a représenté cet après-midi les doléances.

Monsieur le Président, la question, telle que posée, suscite déjà de nombreuses réactions qui guideront sûrement les membres de la Commission au moment où ils auront à formuler des recommandations.

Ils seront attentifs, je l'espère, aux objections de groupes et d'individus qui craignent avec raison les retombées négatives potentiellement graves tant au plan écologique qu'humain, de projets militaires dont il y a lieu de croire qu'on n'en avait pas évalué tous les risques au moment où fut prise la décision de leur donner suite.

Je me propose de mettre en lumière une raison additionnelle de s'inquiéter, car la question telle que formulée en cache une autre; une question préalable, c'est ça que j'appelle une question préalable. Elle en cache une autre aux implications encore plus dramatiques.

C'est celle qui concerne la finalité du projet lui-même, la raison d'être de ces manoeuvres militaires supposément destinées à assurer notre sécurité. Autrement dit, avant d'évaluer l'impact sur l'environnement d'exercices de ce genre, il faut se demander: À quoi servent-ils? Assurent-ils notre sécurité ou la compromettent-ils? Existe-t-il d'autres options que la militarisation en douce de notre pays?

On invoque, pour légitimer les vols à basse altitude, nos engagements envers l'OTAN. Il s'agirait d'une initiative de nature préventive, visant à nous mettre en état de combat au cas où éclaterait un conflit.

Au fait, certains des avions utilisés actuellement sont capables, dit-on, d'aller porter la guerre chez l'ennemi, pouvant même transporter des charges nucléaires.

Autrement dit, les vols à basse altitude font partie d'un processus pouvant conduire à une troisième guerre mondiale, laquelle, par suite de l'énorme puissance de destruction des armes utilisées, aboutirait à l'extermination de populations entières et marquerait la fin de la civilisation dont nous sommes les héritiers.

Ce choix, non explicité, est, dans sa substance même, un choix militariste. Il s'inspire d'une lecture de la réalité qui ne conçoit la légitime défense que sous l'angle de la violence et du recours aux armes. Dans sa dimension potentiellement nucléaire, il reflète le syndrome de l'exterminisme dont parle E.P. Thompson et accélère le processus que le même auteur qualifie d'isomorphisme des puissances exterministes. Car il ne fait point de doute que l'on retrouve, aux divers paliers décisionnels soviétiques, la présence du même syndrome, porteur de séquelles également effarantes.

Ceux qui sont en train d'enclencher discrètement le processus pouvant conduire éventuellement à une troisième guerre mondiale auront profit à méditer les propos suivants, que je tire de la célèbre Lettre pastorale, publiée par les évêques américains sur le défi de la paix en juin quatre-vingt-trois ('83). Et je cite:

"Fondamentalement",

disent les évêques,

> "nous disons que les décisions prises à propos des armes nucléaires font partie des questions morales les plus pressantes de notre époque. Même si, de toute évidence, ces questions sont d'ordre militaire et politique, elles impliquent des choix moraux fondamentaux. Plus simplement, nous

> disons que les bonnes intentions",

exemple,

> "défendre son pays en protégeant la liberté, et le reste, ne peuvent justifier des méthodes immorales, l'emploi d'armes qui tuent sans discrimination et menacent la société toute entière. Nous craignons que notre monde et notre nation ne s'orientent dans une mauvaise direction. Chaque jour, on fabrique de plus en plus d'armes toujours plus destructrices. Des nations de plus en plus nombreuses cherchent à devenir des puissances nucléaires. Nous craignons qu'aujourd'hui, dans notre recherche d'une sécurité de plus en plus grande, nous ne tombions en réalité toujours davantage dans l'insécurité."

Fin de la citation.

Il s'offre, monsieur le Président, un autre chemin pour bâtir la paix que la préparation de la guerre, une autre voie que des stratégies dites préventives mais qui, vues par l'adversaire, peuvent aisément apparaître comme étant des manoeuvres préparant une éventuelle agression. Mais pour reconnaître la valeur pratique d'une stratégie qui recherche la paix sans passer par la victoire des armes, il faut se libérer de l'anthropologie militariste et effectuer une conversion culturelle et un virage moral.

Et à partir de là, on peut, au sujet du problème soumis à l'attention de la Commission d'évaluation, formuler des propositions qui se démarquent sans doute de celles à la mode chez les militaristes et les stratèges, mais qui ne sont pas, pour cette raison, moins réalistes ni moins opérationnelles. Par exemple:

Premièrement, au nom de l'option pour la paix qui est enracinée dans l'option pour la vie, il faut refuser l'enclenchement du processus conduisant à une troisième guerre mondiale, processus dont les vols à basse altitude sont les signes annonciateurs;

Deuxièmement, il faut s'interroger sur la participation canadienne aux activités de l'OTAN, surtout en ce qui concerne de près ou de loin les stratégies débouchant sur l'utilisation d'armes nucléaires;

Troisièmement, il faut revendiquer, pour les citoyens ordinaires que nous sommes, le droit d'être consultés au sujet de la militarisation de notre pays, le commerce des armes, les vols à basse altitude et le reste. Ici, je reprends, je dirais ce slogan de jeunes pacifistes américains disant: "No annihilation without representation", c'est ça le sens de cette proposition. Nous avons le droit que se pratique, en des matières aussi graves, la démocratisation des prises de décision, par des débats publics, par la tenue de consultations populaires et le reste. Pourquoi pas, pourquoi pas, messieurs les membres de la Commission, pourquoi pas un référendum, au moins au Québec et au Labrador, vous pourriez le proposer à notre gouvernement au Québec, un référendum sur les vols à basse altitude?

Quatrièmement, privilégier et appuyer les négociations sur le désarmement et les diverses formes d'échanges et de contacts susceptibles de réduire les tensions, d'effacer les méfiances et de susciter le respect envers les hommes et les femmes qui vivent sous des régimes politiques inspirés par des idéologies opposées à nos convictions et à notre choix de société;

Cinquièmement, nous pensons que l'option pour la paix mérite et requiert des investissements considérables, d'ordre intellectuel et scientifique. Il apparaît donc impératif de réorienter vers les disciplines les plus susceptibles de faire progresser les connaissances relatives aux causes de conflits et à la solution pacifique de ces conflits, par exemple, le droit, l'histoire, la sociologie, l'anthropologie, la psychologie sociale, la polémologie, la théologie, l'éthique, et caetera, donc, réorienter vers ces disciplines une partie des ressources consacrées à la recherche de nouvelles armes, à l'achat d'engins de mort, à la militarisation du Nord, et le reste.

Le budget militaire du Canada frôle les dix (10) milliards. Pensons à tout ce qu'on pourrait réaliser avec un pour cent (1%) seulement de ce budget, en recherches sur la paix, en travail d'information, d'éducation et de sensibilisation.

Sixièmement, le rideau de fer, nous le savons tous, protège un lourd système de répression qui empêche de dialoguer librement avec des millions d'hommes et de femmes qu'on nous présente comme des ennemis. Il est urgent d'inventer et de développer des stratégies permettant de rejoindre d'une façon ou de l'autre ceux et celles qui nous connaissent mal, qui ont aussi peur de nous que nous avons peur d'eux et à qui on a aussi fait accroire que la sécurité collective passe par la course aux armements et la militarisation à outrance.

Il faut se parler, dialoguer, mieux se comprendre, mieux se respecter. En ces matières, nos méthodes et nos comportements sont rudimentaires et primitifs. Nous sommes capables de rejoindre les soviétiques avec des bombes, ah là, on est bon, avec des bombes, mais nous ne savons comment contourner les obstacles qui nous empêchent de leur adresser la parole ou de discuter avec eux.

Il y a là, et ce n'est pas le seul, un domaine de recherche qui devrait avoir préséance sur l'élaboration de projets militaires sophistiqués et coûteux.

Et en conclusion, je dis ceci, messieurs les membres de la Commission, si on pose la question: Où faut-il quérir l'espace nécessaire pour les vols à basse altitude? Réponse: Ni au Québec, ni au Labrador, ni en Turquie, ni ailleurs. Il faut tout simplement, au nom de la morale et de la civilisation, s'interdire ce genre d'activités.

Les endroits qui conviennent le mieux pour de tels engis de mort, ce sont des hangars bien scellés, ou encore des lieux d'enfouissement sanitaire.

On peut, paraphrasant le prophète Isaïe, dire ceci qu'il est urgent de transformer les épées en socs de charrue, les lances en faucilles et de remplacer les avions de combat qui sèment la mort par des inventions utiles au développement des peuples.

Triste époque, monsieur le Président, triste époque que celle où les plus favorisés s'emploient à grands frais à préparer leur propre extermination, tandis que des millions de pauvres sont privés du pain quotidien.

Je vous remercie.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. O'Neill, on behalf of the Panel, thank you very much for your presentation and thank you for making it in such a concise manner.

Because the main purpose of these meetings is to provide information to the Panel that it may use in refining the guidelines into final form, it is not our intention in these meetings to encourage a great deal of cross-questioning of speakers by other members of the audience; not to say that we would entirely forbid that.

However, I would ask if any member of the Panel would like to put a question to Mr. O'Neill at this time?

Very well then, thank you very much, sir.

Our next speaker is Madame Anne Claret, representing le Comité pour la démilitarision de Nitassinan.

PAR MADAME CLARET: J'aimerais commencer en disant que le Comité pour la démilitarisation du Ntesinan appuie la requête des différents groupes qui ont demandé tantôt que les audiences puissent se continuer à la fin du mois de novembre.

Nous-mêmes, nous avons pris connaissance de l'existence de ces audiences aujourd'hui même à Montréal il y a seulement quelques jours.

Cela dit, nous nous questionnons sérieusement sur le rôle, voire sur la légitimité de cette Commission, telle qu'elle nous a été présentée, parce qu'elle fait reporter, à notre avis, le fardeau de la preuve sur la victime, à savoir sur les autochtones et c'est aussi aux gens responsables des groupes environnementaux qui doivent montrer qu'il y a des méfaits sur l'environnement, alors qu'on sait très bien qu'il y en a actuellement et puis ça devrait plutôt être aux militaires et au gouvernement à rendre compte à la population plutôt que ce soit toujours les victimes qui doivent rendre compte aux coupables.

Bon, cela dit, puisque la Commission est très très pressée, comme semblait le dire monsieur Yergeau, nous allons présenter quelque chose d'assez court.

C'est une présentation bilingue,

intitulée: "Fichez-nous la paix" et qui prendra la forme d'une courte pièce de théâtre... théâtre d'intervention. Merci.

S'il y en a qui ont des questions après, on est tout à fait ouvert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Our next scheduled speakers represent jointly at least two main interests. I should explain that we have received requests to speak from the Attikamek-Montagnais Council and also from the Community of La Romaine, Québec, and we understand that the speakers wish to co-ordinate this presentation into one overall presentation.

For that reason, and because they come from two different interests, we have allocated two time slots for these speakers so that they may have a maximum of 40 minutes in all for their total presentation.

I would ask Mr. Edmund Malec, if he is ready to come forward and introduce himself and the other speakers. Mr. Malec.

PAR MONSIEUR MALEC: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les membres de la Commission, tout d'abord permettez-moi de vous souligner que nous sommes très heureux d'être ici à Montréal pour participer à des audiences qui permettront à nos voisins du Québec de se prononcer sur les vols militaires à basse altitude qui se déroulent actuellement sur les territoires ancestraux des Montagnais.

Comme vous avez pu le constater au cours des derniers mois, le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais a suivi avec intérêt les audiences publiques de votre Commission sur les vols à basse altitude.

Ce dossier majeur pour les Montagnais de la Basse Côte-Nord ne cesse d'évoluer et aujourd'hui encore, nous allons tenter de répondre à certaines questions et vous permettrez la justesse de nos préoccupations face à la destruction écologique et la militarisation de notre territoire ancestral.

D'abord, monsieur Paul Charest, conseiller scientifique pour le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais va vous donner les commentaires de notre organisation sur les directives émises pour la future étude d'impact.

Ensuite, Jacques Coster, secrétaire

exécutif du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais démontrera qu'un pays comme l'Allemagne de l'Ouest a eu des problèmes énormes avec les vols à basse altitude.

Monsieur Bernard Cléry, coordonnateur des négociations et négociateur en chef des Attikamek et des Montagnais vous invitera à vous demander... ou demander au gouvernement fédéral un élargissement de votre mandat de la Commission.

Enfin, monsieur René Boudreau, employé de la direction du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais et Guy Bellefleur, Montagnais de La Romaine, accompagné de son chef, Basile Bellefleur, témoigneront des événements majeurs que vivent présentement les chasseurs montagnais de La Romaine sur leurs territoires de chasse.

Messieurs les commissaires, merci. Et sans plus tarder, j'invite Monsieur Paul Charest à témoigner à cette Commission.

PAR MONSIEUR CHAREST: Mon nom est Paul Charest, je suis professeur d'anthropologie au département d'anthropologie de l'Université Laval et j'agis comme conseiller scientifique et directeur de recherche pour le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais.

Le texte que je vais lire aujourd'hui s'intitule: "Commentaires et recommandations du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais au sujet du document de la Commission d'évaluation environnementale intitulé: Ébauches de directives pour la préparation d'un énoncé des incidences environnementales des activités aériennes militaires se déroulant au Labrador et au Québec".

Nous avons examiné avec soin les ébauches de directives de la Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec.

Notre intention était de déposer aujourd'hui un texte détaillé de nos commentaires et recommandations.

Cependant, comme notre travail d'analyse et de rédaction n'est pas encore tout à fait complété, nous ne déposerons aujourd'hui que les grandes lignes de nos commentaires et recommandations. Un texte plus détaillé sera envoyé à la Commission d'ici la fin des audiences publiques.

C'est-à-dire d'ici le trente et un (31) octobre.

Voici donc en résumé l'essentiel de nos propos, en quatorze (14) points.

Premièrement, le mandat de la Commission devrait inclure l'arrêt des vols à basse altitude qui se poursuivent et même s'accroissent d'année en année depuis dix-neuf cent soixante et dix-neuf (1979).

Deuxièmement, la procédure d'évaluation environnementale du gouvernement fédéral n'a pas été respectée parce que des vols à basse altitude ont été autorisés au Québec depuis dix-neuf cent quatre-vingt-trois (1983), sans évaluation environnementale préalable.

Troisièmement, le modèle d'analyse, c'est-à-dire d'analyse écosystémique, mis de l'avant par la Commission devrait être modifié pour accorder une place prépondérante aux systèmes sociaux et culturels en interaction avec les systèmes naturels.

Quatrièmement, la Commission doit définir elle-même les critères d'évaluation des incidences environnementales et non pas en laisser le soin au promoteur-responsable, c'est-à-dire le ministère de la Défense, ou aux exécutants de recherches et analyses.

De façon générale, ces critères

devraient concerner la qualité de la vie sociale et culturelle des populations humaines touchées directement ou indirectement par le projet et sur le maintien des équilibres naturels des écosystèmes.

Cinquièmement, en raison de l'immensité des territoires concernés, de la très grande diversité sociale et culturelle des communautés touchées, une attention spéciale devra être accordée au choix des personnes et firmes qui réaliseront les études et prépareront les énoncés des incidences. Il faudra aussi tenir compte des différences linguistiques: Inuktitut, Montagnais, Naskapi, Anglais, Français.

Sixièmement, la collaboration des groupes autochtones sera essentielle à la réalisation d'études économiques, sociales et culturelles valables. Certains groupes ou communautés, comme les Montagnais en particulier, disposent déjà de corpus de données et de rapports de recherches très élaborés.

Les conditions d'une collaboration des communautés autochtones aux études d'impact devront faire l'objet de négociations préalables avec la Commission. Il est terminé le temps où les communautés autochtones voyaient défiler les chercheurs de tous genres sans même être impliquées dans leurs travaux et sans être informées de leurs résultats.

Septièmement, une attention toute particulière doit aussi être accordée à la définition des cadres spatial et démographique des travaux d'étude et d'analyse.

En fait, outre le territoire et les communautés du Labrador, les projets touchent aussi une partie importante des territoires et des populations des régions du Nouveau-Québec et de la Basse Côte-Nord du Saint-Laurent: communautés Inuit, Cris, Naskapi, Montagnaises et blanches.

Au total, environ dix mille (10 000) autochtones sont concernés directement ou indirectement par les projets du ministère de la Défense nationale et non pas seulement huit cents (800) comme le laissent souvent entendre les communiqués de presse et autre documents d'information émanant de ce ministère.

Huitièmement, les directives au sujet de la description du projet sont incomplètes; a) en ce qui a trait aux vols à basse altitude, toutes les informations doivent aussi porter sur les vols réalisés depuis dix-neuf cent soixante et dix-neuf (1979); b) pour ce qui concerne la base d'entraînement tactique, les informations doivent comprendre la description des équipements électroniques utilisés dans la simulation d'attaque et de contre-attaque, c'est-à-dire, en anglais, Electronic Counter Measures et Jamming Procedure, émettant des radiations électromagnétiques.

Neuvièmement, l'actuel projet de base d'entraînement tactique est défini de façon minimale et trop succincte. Par ailleurs, les représentants du ministère de la Défense affirment qu'il subira de constantes modifications dans les mois, voire dans les années à venir.

Nous nous demandons donc, dans ces circonstances, quel projet sera soumis à l'évaluation environnementale par la Défense d'ici quelques semaines?

La Commission acceptera-t-elle que ce projet soit constamment modifié pendant le processus d'évaluation?

Dixièmement, malgré l'imminence de décisions à prendre dans le cas de la base d'entraînement tactique, nous recommandons que la Commission exige que le promoteur-responsable accorde tout le temps et toutes les ressources nécessaires à la réalisation des études environnementales et socioculturelles et à la préparation de l'énoncé des incidences.

À notre avis, ces travaux devraient s'échelonner sur une période d'au moins deux (2) années et probablement davantage.

Onzièmement, l'analyse des retombées économiques des projets de la Défense nationale doit aussi être faite avec beaucoup de rigueur et d'attention, en raison de la publicité déjà en cours à Terre-Neuve et au Labrador autour des emplois à créer et de leurs effets multiplicateurs dans la région de Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Les incidences économiques négatives, telles que la réduction des niveaux de récolte faunique des autochtones et les coûts sociaux accrus, ainsi que le versement de compensations aux populations lésées, devront aussi être étudiées en détail.

Il apparaît essentiel que des études de terrain sur la situation économique actuelle des communautés autochtones et non-autochtones soient réalisées, car aucune donnée officielle ne peut fournir une compréhension adéquate, en particulier en ce qui concerne certains secteurs d'activités comme celui des activités traditionnelles de chasse, pêche, piégeage et collecte.

Douzièmement, bien que mentionnées au passage, les répercussions sur la santé des projets du ministère de la Défense n'ont fait l'objet d'aucune directive précise dans le document de la Commission, ce qui nous apparaît comme une lacune grave.

À ce sujet, nous ne croyons pas que l'étude réalisée par l'Association canadienne d'hygiène publique à la demande du gouvernement de Terre-Neuve fournisse des résultats probants, car aucun protocole d'étude de terrain ne fait partie de la démarche adoptée.

Treizièmement, il en est de même pour l'étude sur le caribou commandée au professeur Harrington. Étant limitée au petit troupeau sédentaire des monts Red Wine, cette étude nous apparaît difficilement applicable au grand troupeau nomade du fleuve George. Des études spécifiques devront être faites pour ce troupeau d'importance majeure pour les activités de chasse des autochtones et des non-autochtones.

Quatorzièmement, finalement il est très important que les expériences connues d'exercices semblables dans d'autres pays ou régions, par exemple en Allemagne fédérale, dans le désert du Nevada, à la base de Cold Lake en Alberta, soient documentées de façon détaillée à partir d'informations et d'études provenant de personnes et organismes neutres ou affectés directement, c'est-à-dire par des témoignages, et non pas seulement à partir d'informations recueillies auprès des militaires.

J'ai terminé, monsieur le Président.

PAR MONSIEUR MALEC: Monsieur le Président, monsieur le Commissaire Jacques Coster.

PAR MONSIEUR COSTER: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les commissaires, mesdames, messieurs, les membres de la Commission se rappelleront sans doute que lors de l'audience de La Romaine, mon intervention portait sur la situation prévalant en Allemagne fédérale par rapport aux vols à basse altitude dans cette région d'Europe.

Ce pays où la population endure depuis beaucoup plus longtemps qu'ici les expériences de ces vols a eu le temps déjà d'en constater plus sûrement les effets.

Je rappelle qu'en R.F.A., le nombre de plaintes envers les inconvénients résultant de ces vols se comptent par plusieurs milliers. Il y en avait déjà trois mille (3 000) en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984). Mais ce qui est plus important, c'est que des poursuites directement liées à des lésions corporelles ou psychiques découlant de ces vols à basse altitude sont également nombreuses dans ce pays.

J'insisterai également que les dommages importants subis par des humains de la R.F.A. et découlant de ces vols, là où ils ont lieux, résultent d'essais de vols à basse altitude, permis jusqu'à une limite extrême de soixante-quinze (75) mètres au-dessus du sol et que dans le cas qui nous préoccupe au Labrador et dans le nord du Québec, ces vols sont ou seront couramment pratiqués à trente (30) mètres du sol et même moins si cela s'avère possible.

Mon intervention d'aujourd'hui n'a pour but que de déposer à la Commission quelques exemplaires de poursuites déposées devant les tribunaux de l'Allemagne fédérale et pour démontrer que ces dernières, parmi d'autres, sont directement reliées à des cas de personnes ayant subi des dommages importants résultant des expériences de vol à basse altitude.

J'ai donc en main, pour prouver ce que je viens de dire, les copies de sept (7) poursuites qui ont été entreprises en R.F.A. contre les responsables de ces vols et en l'occurrence, le ministre de la Défense de ce pays, le Docteur Manfred Worner, en tant que chef suprême de l'armée de l'Allemagne fédérale.

Ces exemples de procédures juridiaires n'ont pour but que d'éclairer les membres de la commission publique ici présents sur ce qui découle d'une situation déjà vécue ailleurs depuis nombre d'années et sur ce que l'on a à s'attendre ici si l'on ne prend pas garde.

Bien entendu, s'il s'agissait d'une

cour de justice, il nous serait facile de nous référer à de bien plus nombreux cas et d'en étudier leur jurisprudence et leurs procédures.

Pour l'instant, notre but n'est donc que d'éclairer les membres de cette Commission et que nous informons que ces documents n'originent pas de vagues sources, mais sont des documents judiciaires officiels demandés par le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais à un éminent juriste allemand que nous savions avoir engagé des poursuites contre le gouvernement fédéral de ce pays et qui a bien voulu, à notre demande, nous faire parvenir des copies de ces pièces se rapportant à des exemples de poursuites qu'il a engagées pour des clients ayant subi des dommages consécutifs à des vols militaires à basse altitude.

Les poursuites engagées par cet avocat qui pratique à Nagold, ville de la province du Bade, sont engagées auprès de la Cour Suprême du Sénat criminel de Stuttgart en R.F.A.

Ce juriste se nomme Docteur Eisenhart Von Loeper et qui, pour respecter les procédures criminelles de son pays, intente des poursuites au responsable désigné, c'est-à-dire le ministre de la Défense de la R.F.A., puisqu'il est, par ses fonctions, le chef suprême des armées.

Vous trouverez dans la traduction de

ces documents rédigés à l'origine en langue allemande et dont vous trouverez les textes originaux, mais dont je m'excuse que ceux traduits en français sont d'un style quelque peu laborieux, ceci résultant qu'en Allemagne, comme dans bien d'autres pays, les textes juridiques sont rédigés dans une forme de langage fort peu accessible au commun des mortels.

Ce qui est néanmoins intéressant de constater dans ces documents, c'est qu'en dehors des méfaits physiques et psychiques notoires subis par des personnes dans des cas très précis, c'est qu'ils sont certifiés à chaque fois par des spécialistes médicaux des plus officiels et donc confirmables.

Tous ces cas sont également récents puisqu'ils concernent des événements ayant eu lieu dans les années quatre-vingt-quatre ('84), quatre-vingt-cinq ('85) et quatre-vingt-six ('86).

Ces événements concernent plus particulièrement des cas de méfaits subis par de jeunes enfants ou vieillards suite à des vols à basse altitude et à chaque fois, comme je l'ai déjà souligné, qui ont été certifiés par des spécialistes.

En outre, vous trouverez dans ces documents, les avis de divers experts reconnus en acoustique, en psychologie, en médecine industrielle et du travail, en environnement et même d'experts militaires qui corroborent les effets néfastes de ces vols à basse altitude sur les humaines.

On mentionne également le dépassement des normes autorisées par les lois en vigueur en R.F.A., que ce soit par le bruit, dans la sécurité publique ou envers l'atteinte à l'intégrité physique des personnes humaines.

Je remets donc ces documents aux membres de la Commission publique pour qu'ils puissent les étudier et en faire, nous l'espérons, un parallèle avec ces mêmes expériences au Canada.

Je recommanderais également aux membres de la Commission de procéder à des recherches en Allemagne fédérale sur les cas importants de plaintes et de poursuites qui existent dans ce pays. Merci.

PAR MONSIEUR MALEC: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les commissaires, je vous présente monsieur Bernard Cléry, chef négociateur et coordonnateur des négociations.

PAR MONSIEUR CLÉRY: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les commissaires, messieurs les membres de l'exécutif du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais, monsieur le chef de La Romaine, messieurs les participants à cette audience, mesdames, messieurs, nous voici rendus presque à la fin de la première partie de cette étude environnementale, première partie qui a comme principal objectif d'ébaucher les directives qui devraient conduire à l'acceptation des activités aériennes sur le territoire revendiqué des Montagnais de la Basse Côte-Nord ou, tout au plus, à l'énoncé des incidences environnementales de ces activités militaires qui partent du Labrador.

C'est la directive qu'a donnée le ministre canadien de la Défense, monsieur Perrin Beatty, dans une déclaration faite à la presse le douze (12) décembre dernier, aux membres de la Commission et je cite:

> "Il est évident ..."

disait monsieur Beatty:

> "que les opposants aux projets ne le feront pas avorter si les seize (16) pays membres de l'OTAN choisissent Goose Bay à leur réunion du début de décembre quatre-vingt-six ('86), à Bruxelles. Mais ils auront au moins

> eu l'occasion de faire connaître leurs préoccupations et il n'est pas dit qu'on n'en tiendra pas compte."

Fin de la citation.

Une telle déclaration montre bien le respect que porte le ministre de la Défense nationale aux travaux de cette Commission, le respect que le ministre de la Défense nationale porte aux gens qui, honnêtement, auront cru qu'il était important pour tous de faire connaître leurs vues de spécialistes dans un dossier aussi crucial qui pourrait détruire à jamais la vie humaine et animale d'un territoire aussi important, le respect que le ministre de la Défense nationale porte aux Montagnais qui revendiquent, par les voies pacifiques de la négociation, un territoire ancestral qui n'a jamais été conquis, qui n'a jamais été cédé, le respect que le ministre de la Défense nationale porte à la population canadienne et québécoise en ne lui permettant pas d'accepter ou de refuser la militarisation de son pays, geste excessivement lourd de conséquences qui pourrait avoir des suites énormes en cas de guerre mondiale.

Qu'est-ce qu'on ne ferait pas pour une poignée de dollars?

À nous tous, Canadiens, Québécois,

Montagnais, spécialistes de l'environnement ou du développement social, membres de la Commission, on nous demande d'avoir la foi du charbonnier et de croire aux généraux de l'armée qui veulent leur jeu électronique pour permettre aux jeunes "rockers" en F-18 de l'armée canadienne et des pays membres de l'OTAN de s'amuser en temps de paix, chez nous, alors que plusieurs ne le peuvent pas chez eux.

En choeur, debout, tous ensemble, nous devrions leur dire: Non merci. Et, comme ce bon vieux Montagnais de la communauté de Natashquan, monsieur Antoine Malec, qui témoignait avec énormément d'éloquence et d'aplomb aux audiences de La Romaine, les inviter à aller jouer ailleurs ou pratiquer leurs manoeuvres destructrices sur la lune.

Monsieur le Président, messieurs les membres de cette Commission, au cours de ces audiences, rares ont été les groupes d'intervenants qui ont prôné ce développement et ceux qui l'ont fait, comme ce fut le cas plus particulièrement à Goose Bay, laissaient toujours un arrière goût d'intérêts financiers que les promoteurs et le gouvernement fédéral avaient fait miroiter à coup de millions investis dans la mise en marché du projet.

Ils veulent simplement ramasser la manne en se souciant peu des autres préoccupations comme la militarisation du territoire ou sa destruction écologique.

On pourrait aussi ajouter que, comme ce fut le cas à Schefferville ou dans d'autres villes minières de la Côte-Nord, ils partiront lorsque cette manne sera complètement ramassée en laissant le territoire entièrement détruit aux véritables propriétaires, ceux qui l'habitent depuis des temps immémoriaux, et surtout qui veulent continuer à l'habiter, les Montagnais.

Objectivement, les positions défendues par les vrais occupants du territoire, qui sont actuellement les cobayes de ces vols à basse altitude, les dix mille (10 000) autochtones et non pas huit cents (800) comme le publicisent malhonnêtement les communiqués de presse de l'armée canadienne et les quarante mille (40 000) non-autochtones qui résident à proximité des territoires touchés, expriment clairement qu'ils ne veulent rien savoir de la militarisation du territoire et de sa destruction écologique.

À partir de ce que vous avez entendu au cours des dernières semaines, de ce que vous avez constaté depuis que vous êtes dans ce dossier, des attentes que vous soulevez dans les populations autochtones, qui mettent beaucoup d'espoir dans votre Commission parce que vous êtes notre seul moyen de défense contre le gouvernement canadien, l'armée canadienne et l'OTAN, qui refusent systématiquement de nous entendre, à partir des dangers évidents, soulignés par les spécialistes de l'environnement, des nombreuses questions sans réponse, vous devez exiger un changement de mandat qui vous permettra de dire non à un tel projet si la vie des habitants de ces régions est en danger, si l'environnement est véritablement menacé ou si les promesses faites, comme le développement économique ou autres, ne font pas le poids à côté des inconvénients.

Vous pouvez aussi vous servir des règlements du gouvernement d'Ottawa sur le travail d'évaluation d'un projet à incidences environnementales, et je cite:

> "Le processus d'évaluation et d'examen en matière d'environnement est la procédure établie par le gouvernement du Canada pour voir à ce que les incidences environnementales et sociales des travaux, activités et programmes fédéraux projetés sont déterminés d'avance, afin qu'on puisse tenir compte des facteurs environnementaux et sociaux au cours de la planification."

Dans le cas présent, il ne fait aucun doute que les incidences environnementales n'ont pas été déterminées à l'avance comme le mentionne la procédure fédérale. Particulièrement dans le cas du Labrador et de la Basse Côte-Nord où les manoeuvres aériennes s'y déroulent depuis mil neuf cent soixante-dix-neuf (1979).

La Commission peut donc s'interroger sérieusement sur la légitimité du mandat confié, d'autant plus qu'il ne correspond pas aux directives gouvernementales habituelles dans tels cas, et demander au ministre de l'Environnement, au ministre de l'Expansion industrielle, au ministre des Affaires indiennes et du Nord canadien, au ministre des Relations extérieures, au ministre des Transports, au ministre des Travaux publics, au ministre de la Santé nationale et surtout au premier ministre du Canada - des personnes qui se cachent derrière le tout puissant ministre de la Défense nationale, ministère considéré comme un intouchable - comment il serait logiquement possible de tenir compte des facteurs environnementaux et sociaux au cours de la planification alors qu'on en est rendu aux réalisations du projet: ententes bilatérales avec plusieurs pays membres de l'OTAN pour des vols à basse altitude et zone de tir au sud du lac Minnipi.

Donc, en toute logique, le gouvernement fédéral doit modifier ou redéfinir le mandat de cette Commission pour qu'il soit en accord avec la réalité.

C'est donc tout à fait normal que les commissaires demandent une nouvelle définition de leur mandat, en profitant de cette circonstance pour y inclure les possibilités de jouer un rôle véritable pour la société canadienne, et non pas simplement servir de gilet pare-balles pour l'armée canadienne.

Comme nous vous l'avons demandé, à plusieurs reprises, si vous voulez être pris au sérieux, vous devez immédiatement exiger que le gouvernement canadien décrète un moratoire sur les vols à basse altitude tant et aussi longtemps que les études d'impact n'auront pas été complétées et que vous ne soyez pas moralement convaincus qu'il n'y a pas de danger pour la vie humaine et animale.

Si vous ne le faites pas, l'histoire vous reprochera votre inconséquence. On dira simplement de vous que vous avez été les marionnettes de l'armée canadienne.

En exigeant un moratoire, vous irez alors dans le sens du comité fédéral permanent de l'environnement et des forêts qui a demandé, en juin quatre-vingt-six ('86), dans un rapport appuyant l'idée d'un moratoire, au ministre de la Défense nationale d'arrêter immédiatement ces vols à basse altitude et je cite:

> "Le ministre de la Défense nationale devrait mettre fin immédiatement à tous les vols militaires en rase-mottes au-dessus de la Côte-Nord et du Labrador. Le ministre devrait faire évaluer les répercussions de tels vols sur l'environnement dans ces régions et ce dans les plus brefs délais."

Vous appuierez aussi une lettre du président du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais, monsieur Gaston McKenzie, qui vient d'être envoyée au premier ministre du Canada et député du comté où se passent les vols à basse altitude, monsieur Brian Mulroney. Cette lettre souligne aussi que nous sommes en pleines négociations territoriales et qu'un tel développement hypothèque sérieusement notre territoire ancestral que nous voulons faire reconnaître comme une terre montagnaise autonome.

Je pourrais aussi vous ajouter que tous les groupements membres d'une coalition qui nous appuient dans notre lutte pour faire cesser ces vols à basse altitude: la Conférence des évêques, la Commission des droits et libertés, la Confédération des syndicats nationaux, la Fédération des travailleurs du Québec, la Centrale de l'enseignement du Québec, une quarantaine de groupes qui défendent l'environnement et la paix exigent aussi ce moratoire.

C'est donc dire à quel point de nombreux canadiens seront derrière vous pour vous appuyer face à notre demande de changement de mandat et du moratoire des vols à basse altitude qui devrait l'accompagner.

Je dois vous avouer candidement que nous allons tout faire pour que le ministère de l'Environnement du Québec fasse sa propre étude environnementale. Nous croyons que ce ministère québécois ne peut plus continuer à jouer à l'autruche et laisser l'armée canadienne détruire impunément une partie importante du territoire qui leur a été prêté par les Montagnais et que nous voulons retrouver le plus indemne possible. D'autant plus que vous ne semblez pas avoir le mandat d'y changer quoi que ce soit. Les dés seront peut-être moins pipés avec le gouvernement québécois.

Monsieur le Président, lors des audiences à Schefferville, vous nous avez confirmé que l'armée canadienne avait accepté d'organiser une démonstration de vols à basse altitude tel que nous vous l'avions demandé à La Romaine.

Or, telle ne fut pas ma surprise d'apprendre, tout à fait par hasard d'ailleurs la semaine dernière, que la démonstration avait lieu, en privé, pour les membres de la Commission et que nous n'étions pas invités à y assister.

Pourtant, notre demande avait été claire: Nous voulions, et je cite:

> "Que l'armée canadienne organise une exhibition de vols à basse altitude pour que les membres de la Commission, les spécialistes, les populations concernées et la population canadienne en général puissent juger, au vu et au su de tout le monde, des effets négatifs de ces vols pour en parler avec plus de connaissance et avoir un jugement plus éclairé sur cette importante question."

On a préféré faire ça en famille, à l'abri des regards indiscrets des gens intéressés, des spécialistes et des membres de la presse.

Où est donc rendue la limpidité des intentions de l'armée canadienne, maintes fois soulignée, avec tant de candeur, par son colporteur attitré. Une telle attitude, pour le moins surprenante, nous porte à nous interroger sérieusement sur ce que l'on veut cacher.

J'espère que la Commission et l'armée canadienne ne nous croyaient pas assez naïfs pour accepter que l'on règle en catimini cette question importante sous des prétextes du genre secret d'État. S'il vous plaît, soyons un peu plus sérieux.

Avant de terminer, je vous demande de permettre à monsieur René Boudreau, employé de direction du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais, de vous faire un compte-rendu des commentaires qu'il a été chercher sur le territoire en rencontrant des familles montagnaises qui ont vécu au cours des derniers jours ces vols à basse altitude. Ces chasseurs vivent présentement là où les avions s'exercent. Il arrive tout juste de cette tournée. Ces commentaires ont été pris sur vidéo-cassettes, mais le temps ne nous a pas permis d'en faire une production valable.

Pour ceux qui pourraient avoir à l'esprit que monsieur Boudreau exagère les propos des Montagnais sur ce territoire, qui vivent ces vols à basse altitude, permettez-moi de vous citer le témoignage d'un des membres du Comité permanent des Affaires autochtones, monsieur Keith Penner, au cours d'une réunion le douze (12) juin quatre-vingt-six ('86).

Monsieur Penner a raconté son

expérience personnelle des vols militaires à basse altitude. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous ajouter que monsieur Penner n'est pas un Montagnais, ni le député de la Basse Côte-Nord.

Le député de la Basse Côte-Nord, comme vous le savez sans doute, est notre illustre premier ministre du Canada, monsieur Brian Mulroney, le p'tit gars de la Côte-Nord qui, entre parenthèses, est terriblement silencieux sur ce dossier important pour ses électeurs.

Voici donc ce que monsieur Penner a raconté:

"J'ai une anecdote pour vous, une blague, si vous le permettez, monsieur le Président.

Il y a un an environ, je faisais du pouce dans une des régions les plus isolées du monde, au nord du Pays de Galles, sur le Mont Snowdon, et un jet est venu, dont on ne sait où, m'a passé par-dessus la tête en rase-mottes. Je dois vous dire que le caucus libéral a failli perdre un de ses membres. J'étais terrorisé et j'ai failli perdre la vie sur les flancs du Mont Snowdon.

Je n'ai eu aucun avertissement. J'en ris maintenant parce que cela remonte à un an. Mais à l'époque, je puis vous assurer que je ne riais pas. J'étais écrasé contre le sol, tremblant de tous mes membres. Je sympathise donc avec les Innus qui ont eu cette expérience alors qu'ils étaient à la chasse, la pêche ou en train de piéger. Ce n'est pas le genre d'expérience qu'on aimerait avoir deux (2) fois dans son existence."

Un tel témoignage, totalement impartial, à lui seul devrait en faire réfléchir plus d'un.

Monsieur le Président, messieurs les commissaires, je tiens à vous remercier au nom du Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais de nous avoir permis d'exprimer librement ce que nous ressentons face à ce projet de l'armée canadienne.

Nous l'avons fait d'une façon honnête, sans fard, pour que vous compreniez bien notre sentiment. J'espère que les mots employés ne vous auront pas blessés personnellement. Ils ne s'adressaient jamais à vous comme individus, mais simplement à ce que vous représentez comme membre d'une telle commission.

Nous savons à quel point votre travail est important. Nous savons que vous avez un rôle majeur et délicat. Nous savons que vous êtes placés entre l'arbre et l'écorce. Nous savons aussi que le travail qu'on vous a demandé a ses limites.

Nous savons que les enjeux sont énormes et que nous nous attaquons à un très gros morceau. Nous savons que les décisions du gouvernement du Canada sont prises. Nous savons que les p'tits Montagnais ne pèsent pas lourd contre les généraux de l'armée canadienne. Nous savons que l'on nous considère comme des moins que rien. Nous savons que l'on nous décrit comme des empêcheurs de tourner en rond.

Cependant, nous croyons que votre honnêteté va réussir à dominer sur les embûches. Nous croyons que vous ne vous laisserez pas baillonner par qui que ce soit. Nous croyons que votre objectivité sera plus forte que les intérêts obscurs de l'armée canadienne. Nous croyons que votre sens des responsabilités ne permettra pas que l'on continue à bafouer toute logique. Nous croyons que vous vous porterez à la défense des plus démunis dans ce dossier. Nous croyons que vous pouvez alerter l'opinion publique en dénonçant les manières cavalières de l'armée canadienne dans ce dossier. Nous croyons que vous pouvez dire à l'armée canadienne et au gouvernement fédéral que vous n'êtes pas des marionnettes que l'on manipule au gré et à la fantaisie des tout-puissants.

Vous perdrez peut-être des contrats du gouvernement fédéral et votre carrière de commissaire aura eu une courte durée, mais vous gagnerez l'estime des canadiens, car vous aurez accompli votre devoir, sans influence indue de qui que ce soit.

Ça, c'est inestimable.

Merci. Mais avant de terminer, je voudrais vous dire que le Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais appuie la demande qui a été formulée tantôt pour que d'autres audiences permettent à des gens qui sans aucun doute vont nous appuyer dans ce dossier-là, permettent à ces gens de témoigner et de dire leur expérience dans un dossier aussi crucial. Quinze (15) jours de retard, pour nous, ne seraient pas la fin du monde et je pense que si la Commission voulait, il y aurait des possibilités. Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cleary, excuse me for interrupting; I will be sure to give your group a fair amount of time, but I did want to comment on one point in your presentation, Mr. Cleary.

With regard to a demonstration by the military of low-flying exercises, it was not and is not the intent of the Panel to have such a demonstration conducted in private. As a matter of fact, we did arrange with the Department of National Defence to put on such a demonstration for the Panel and technical experts that are engaged by the Panel on the afternoon of Wednesday of last week. At that time we made the planned demonstration known to members of the news media, both of Labrador and of Québec, and invited them to participate.

There was going to be involvement of the news media at the time. Unfortunately, the weather did not permit the carrying out of the demonstration, so we have not had that yet, but we plan to arrange it again at some future date and it will be arranged at that time on the same sort of basis. We believe by inviting the news media to be present, that it can be observed by them and reported by them to the Canadian public.

We hardly feel that it would be practical to try to invite along representatives of all the interested participants in this review.

So, all in all, we hope that the other participants will understand our intent in this, and, as I say again, there is no intention of having this conducted in private.

One more thing, if I might ask all of the other speakers if they would have a little consideration for our interpreter this afternoon, who is working very hard, and is having a little difficulty sometimes with the speed of the presentations. So, if I could ask people to present a little more slowly in consideration of the interpreter. Thank you very much.

Gentlemen, would you please proceed. The gentlemen at the table still have approximately 10 minutes left to finish their presentation. There could be some time for questions after that, if that is all right? Go ahead, gentlemen.

PAR MONSIEUR BOUDREAU: Mesdames et messieurs ici présents...

PAR MONSIEUR LOUIS GILLES FRANCOEUR: Serait-il possible, un point d'ordre, s'il vous plaît?

Vous avez parlé des journalistes et j'aimerais vous poser une question là-dessus parce que ça nous touche, nous en sommes.

Mon nom est Louis Gilles Francoeur du journal Le Devoir et je voudrais vous poser la question suivante: Vous avez dit que les journalistes ont été invités à assister à ces vols. Je couvre le dossier depuis le début, je suis sur la liste d'envoi de votre Commission, je n'ai jamais reçu d'invitation et je ne pense pas qu'aucun de mes collègues à côté de moi en ait reçu une.

Je voudrais vous demander, monsieur le Président, qu'est-ce qui fait que les journalistes attitrés à ce dossier n'ont pas été invités à cette démonstration?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was my understanding, sir, that an invitation was extended to certain journalists, whose names were known to us. This was done on behalf of the Panel by our Secretariat; not to indicate any blame on them. I would suggest that if you were not contacted this time, that you speak to our Executive Secretary while you are here today and ensure that you would be advised of such an event whenever it is to be rescheduled.

Gentlemen, would you care to proceed?

PAR MONSIEUR BOUDREAU: Si vous me permettez mon témoignage, dans le cadre d'une recherche sur le mode de vie actuel des Montagnais de la Basse Côte-Nord et le mode de vie traditionnel, j'ai passé toute la semaine dernière en communication étroite avec à peu près toutes les familles qui vivent actuellement dans le bois au nord de La Romaine.

Par un intermédiaire, Edmond Nastapeo, on a contacté sous le mode de radio-émetteur et samedi toute la journée, avec un avion Beaver, on a enregistré un reportage dans plusieurs campements où sont actuellement ces familles.

Je vous dis immédiatement que la moitié du village de La Romaine est dans le bois au moment où on se parle actuellement, c'est-à-dire à peu près soixante et quinze (75) familles, incluant grand-père, grand-mère et de nombreux enfants.

Le territoire couvert est un immense territoire qui se rend, d'après ce dont j'ai pu me rendre compte, jusqu'à peu près cent cinquante (150) milles au nord de La Romaine, c'est-à-dire autour de la frontière du Labrador.

On nous a relaté, particulièrement dans les zones de chaînes de lacs ou dans des vallées ou des gorges importantes de bassins hydrographiques comme celui de la rivière Petit Mekatsina, celui de la rivière Romaine, celui de la rivière Natashquan, de nombreux vols à basse altitude dans à peu près tous les secteurs durant les trois (3) dernières semaines. Et particulièrement dans le secteur du lac Guinness, du lac Fourmont, du lac Philippo, du lac Mariette, et du lac Brissonnet, on nous rapporte des vols réguliers qui vont aller jusqu'à deux (2) ou trois (3) fois par jour, d'ensembles d'aéronefs qui jouent autour, d'entre deux (2) aéronefs à neuf (9) chasseurs militaires à la fois, dans des vallées, à très basse altitude.

Il y a plusieurs témoignages qui m'ont été relatés à l'effet qu'il y a plusieurs cas de gastro-entérite actuellement sur plusieurs campements.

On me rapporte, entre autres, des cas de surdité assez impressionnants, particulièrement une vieille madame du lac Philippo qui, suite à un vol à très basse altitude au-dessus de sa tête, a eu les oreilles bouchées pendant à peu près deux (2) ou trois (3) jours.

Je voulais vous dire aussi une chose qui est importante, qu'on m'a fait comprendre, c'est qu'un campement indien, ce n'est pas une roulotte aéroportée sur le bout d'une petite presqu'île au bord d'un grand lac, c'est un ensemble de déplacements réguliers et périodiques sur un territoire de deux (2) ou trois (3) familles qui couvrent à peu près une vingtaine (20) de kilomètres d'après ce que j'ai pu comprendre. Et uniquement dans le secteur de la chaîne de lacs Philippo, Marian et Brissonnet, les territoires de chasse d'un ensemble de familles arrêtent là où les territoires de chasse de la deuxième famille commencent. Ce qui veut dire que uniquement dans cet ensemble de lacs là, on couvre une superficie de déplacements réguliers sur les lignes de trappe d'à peu près une centaine de kilomètres.

Je disais tout à l'heure qu'on m'a rapporté plusieurs cas de diarrhée, des cas de surdité, des cas d'oreilles bouchées, des cas de boutons autour de la bouche des enfants et à trois (3) endroits au moins, particulièrement au lac Philippo, des situations où l'eau était verte, ce que les indiens n'ont jamais vu. On ne sait pas si c'est relié aux vols militaires, mais là-dessus, je vous donne le témoignage du pilote du Beaver de la compagnie Proper qui m'a accompagné du lever au coucher du soleil samedi, c'est-à-dire avant-hier.

Le pilote me disait qu'il y a quelques mois, juste avant un décollage de son avion Otter dans le secteur de la rivière Aux Feuilles, près de la rivière George, deux (2) avions militaires qu'il n'a pas pu identifier lui ont passé juste au-dessus de la tête et pendant plusieurs secondes, des retombées... il me décrit ça en termes de pluie, une pluie de matières visqueuses lui est tombée sur la tête et ça a duré plusieurs secondes. Il pouvait le remarquer même sur son appareil.

Son interprétation était à l'effet que l'essence ou le combustible de ces avions-là n'était pas totalement brûlé lorsque les avions volaient à basse altitude. Vous en ferez ce que vous voudrez, c'est le témoignage que le pilote Jean-Marc Potvin de Proper m'a raconté.

Alors, tout ça pour vous dire qu'on a dû assister depuis quelques semaines à La Romaine au retour de plusieurs enfants au village parce que... les enfants ne peuvent absolument pas bouger du campement principal parce qu'ils ont trop peur. Que plusieurs chefs de famille n'osent plus s'éloigner à plus de deux (2) jours de canot du campement principal alors que ces déplacements-là prenaient une (1) à deux (2) semaines en temps ordinaire, pour aller sur des lignes de trappe.

Ils ont peur pour leurs femmes et leurs enfants restés au campement principal et ils ont peur de sillonner le centre d'à peu près tous les lacs, particulièrement au lac Fourmont, au lac

Brissonnet. Ils vont se contenter de côtoyer le tour des lacs seulement. Ils n'osent plus traverser. Parce qu'à toutes les minutes, à une vitesse effroyable, les avions peuvent leur passer au-dessus de la tête.

Alors, tout ça, messieurs les commissaires, uniquement pour vous dire que la crainte est énorme d'après moi, dans tout le secteur, que la plupart des familles, sinon toutes, craignent énormément pour leur mode de vie et ça, à très court terme, déjà, c'est très grave d'après ce que tout le monde m'a relaté. Et que si la base militaire de l'OTAN s'installe, c'est-à-dire que si les vols viennent décupler... c'est-à-dire si on multiplie par dix (10) le nombre de ces manoeuvres militaires là, particulièrement dans les secteurs de vallées ou de gorges qui sont les secteurs les plus importants pour les Montagnais et j'imagine les plus intéressants pour les avions, ça va être carrément invivable.

Alors, merci de m'avoir permis de faire ce témoignage.

PAR MONSIEUR MALEC: Monsieur le Président, je vais vous présenter Guy Bellefleur.

PAR MONSIEUR BELLEFLEUR: Monsieur le Président, messieurs les commissaires, mesdames et messieurs, je suis venu ici pour vous parler d'un événement qui a eu lieu dernièrement à La Romaine, c'est-à-dire au nord de La Romaine.

Suite aux audiences publiques qu'il y a eues à La Romaine, il y a plusieurs personnes qui sont venues témoigner sur les problèmes qu'ils vivaient avec ces avions militaires. Que nous autres, on appelle les avions de guerre.

Il y a une semaine et demie (1 1/2), une femme est montée dans le bois. Elle était enceinte. Nous autres... c'est-à-dire le conseil de bande, on a toujours averti les femmes qui étaient enceintes de ne pas monter dans le bois à cause des avions qui font du bruit. Le bruit est tellement fort, on les a averties de ne pas aller dans le bois.

Mais cette femme-là, elle a pris une chance, elle est montée dans le bois. Puis le douze (12) octobre de cette année, il y a des avions qui sont passés juste au-dessus du campement principal, au lac Marian. La femme, lorsqu'elle a entendu les avions passer, elle est sortie, elle a eu peur, elle a fait des mouvements brusques, des faux mouvements, ce qui a provoqué une fausse-couche. Elle a été évacuée d'urgence à l'Hôpital de Blanc-Sablon. Le médecin de Blanc-Sablon l'a transférée à Terre-Neuve, à Ste-Antonine. Ce problème-là a été soulevé par les sages qui témoignaient à La Romaine.

Ils vous ont dit ces problèmes-là qu'ils allaient vivre. Et c'est ça qui est arrivé il y a une semaine et demie (1 1/2).

Tout ce qu'on vous a raconté sur ces avions-là, il n'y a aucune exagération. Les spécialistes ici sont... disons s'ils ne nous croient pas ou disons si le gouvernement ne croit pas ce qu'on dit, ils pourraient venir sur place pour constater les problèmes qu'on vit.

Il y a un autre problème que Monsieur Boudreau a soulevé et que je voulais soulever aussi, c'est le problème de diarrhée.

Il y a mon père qui est rendu dans le bois, au Labrador, à cent cinquante (150) milles de La Romaine. Ils sont de cinq (5) à six (6) familles. Ils sont accompagnés des bébés et des enfants de jeune âge, de dix (10) à treize (13) ans.

Quand ils sont arrivés dans le bois, ils ont commencé à consommer de l'eau puis l'eau était jaune, de couleur jaune et des fois elle était verte. Depuis ce temps-là, les bébés ont des problèmes de diarrhée. Ça fait trois (3) semaines.

J'ai un petit gars, il est monté dans

le bois. Il était accompagné de mon beau-père. Il a été obligé de revenir à La Romaine il y a trois (3) jours. Il avait des problèmes de diarrhée. Et là, je ne sais pas si je vais le faire remonter.

Toutes les autres familles ont ce même problème.

Il y a aussi les femmes âgées. Nous autres, quand les bébés étaient malades, ils prenaient des remèdes traditionnels pour guérir les maladies.

Comme on a toujours dit, les avions affectent le territoire, je veux dire la forêt et les plantes médicinales. Les personnes qui pratiquent cette médecine traditionnelle disent que les plantes ne sont pas plus efficaces qu'il y a six (6), sept (7) ans en arrière, c'est-à-dire avant que les avions passent.

Depuis que les avions passent là... c'est-à-dire notre territoire a changé beaucoup puis nos médecines traditionnelles ont tendance beaucoup plus à disparaître. Je crois que nous autres, c'est une grosse perte que nous allons perdre.

Je ne veux pas m'attarder là-dessus, le temps est court. Je vais terminer là-dessus, monsieur le Président. Merci.

PAR MONSIEUR MALEC: Monsieur le Président, au nom du Conseil Attikamik-Montagnais, je vous remercie du temps que vous nous avez alloué pour vous donner notre position.

Je vous remercie beaucoup.

PAR MONSIEUR O'NEILL: Monsieur le Président, c'est simplement pour savoir si des questions pourraient être posées au sujet de ces présentations.

J'aurais une (1) question pour ma part. Okay?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, one (1) question.

PAR MONSIEUR O'NEILL: Et la question s'adresse à vous.

C'est-à-dire que dans un des mémoires présentés, je crois que c'est monsieur Charest qui l'a présenté au nom du Conseil Attikamik-Montagnais, on lit ceci:

> "Que la procédure d'évaluation environnementale du gouvernement fédéral n'a pas été respectée parce que des vols à basse altitude ont été autorisés au Québec depuis mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-trois (1983), sans évaluation environnementale préalable."

Ma question est la suivante, en trois (3) parties, très rapidement. Un (1), est-ce que c'est exact, êtes-vous d'accord avec ça? Deux (2), j'aimerais savoir qui a donné la permission d'autoriser. Et trois (3), est-ce que cette permission d'autoriser a été accordée après consultation du

THE CHAIRMAN: When you speak of authorization, sir, are you referring to authorization of the low-flying exercises that are going on at the present time?

MR. O'NEILL: Oui, oui, c'est celle justement à laquelle on fait allusion dans la texte. On dit que: "La procédure d'évaluation n'a pas été respectée parce que des vols ont été autorisés", alors que la procédure aurait d'abord dû être respectée. Il n'y avait pas d'autorisation. Je voudrais savoir, un (1) est-ce exact? Deux (2), est-ce vous qui avez donné l'autorisation ou d'autres? Trois (3), est-ce qu'elle a été donnée avec ou sans permission du gouvernement du Québec puisqu'il s'agit de quelque chose qui se passe sur le territoire québécois.

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, the authorization for those flights would not have come from, of course, this Panel, or from the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. I presume that the authorization would have come from the Department of National Defence.

There was, in 1981, a preliminary environmental assessment carried out, as Major McCabe has described, involving the production of an initial environmental evaluation document. To my knowledge that is the only environmental assessment that has been carried out in connection with the present low-level flying exercises.

The Federal Environmental Assessment process is essentially one of self-assessment. The Environmental Assessment Review Office does not become involved in an assessment unless requested to do so by the Minister of the Environment and the nature of the process is essentially one of self-assessment unless requested to by the Minister of the Environment, and the nature of the process is such that a review is requested by an initiating department, which is responsible for the Project. There normally would not be such a review unless requested by that department.

In this case, I can only presume that the Department of National Defence conducted an internal review -- first of all, the preliminary review in 1981, and more recently the review which led to initiating of the present public review, which is now in progress. Other than that, I, as the Chairman of the Panel, would not be able to comment on the authorization procedure any further than that.

Thank you very much for your presentation, gentlemen. I would now like to call a 10-minute break in the meeting, after which we will proceed with the next speaker.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, our next speaker this afternoon is Mr. Yves Pagé, representing the Ministry of the Environment of the Province of Québec. Mr. Pagé, whenever you are ready.

PAR MONSIEUR PAGÉ: Messieurs les commissaires, mesdames et messieurs, mon nom est Yves Pagé. Je suis directeur du service des affaires nordiques et amérindiennes au ministère de l'Environnement du Québec.

J'ai pour mandat de vous déposer copie de la lettre que le ministre de l'Environnement du Québec faisait parvenir à ses collègues de l'Environnement et de la Défense nationale du Canada le dix-sept (17) octobre dernier et de vous présenter en détails l'annexe de cette lettre.

Je pourrai alors répondre aux questions relatives à l'annexe, évidemment dans les limites de mes connaissances, compte tenu que ces commentaires sur la directive sont le fruit d'analyses des représentants de plusieurs ministères du gouvernement du Québec.

Si vous le permettez, je vais d'abord vous lire la lettre de monsieur Lincoln avant de présenter l'annexe.

Il s'agit d'une lettre datée du dix-sept (17) octobre et adressée aux deux (2) ministres, monsieur Tom McMillan, ministre de l'Environnement et monsieur Perrin Beatty, ministre de la Défense.

"Messieurs les ministres,

Je vous écris au sujet de l'accroissement des vols militaires à basse altitude au Québec. Je voudrais vous faire part de nos commentaires sur la procédure suivie pour l'évaluation environnementale de cette activité et sur le contenu du projet de directive soumis actuellement à la consultation du public.

Nous constatons qu'aucun processus conjoint d'évaluation environnementale n'a été proposé au gouvernement du Québec pour les projets suivants: accroissement des vols militaires à basse altitude effectués au Québec, agrandissement de la piste de l'aéroport de Saint-Jean, aménagement d'un champ de tir au Lac Saint-Jean. Nous déplorons cette attitude.

Pour ce qui est des vols à basse altitude, la seule participation qui nous est offerte est de nous présenter devant la Commission d'évaluation environnementale. Compte tenu du rôle premier que joue le Québec dans la protection de l'environnement et de la population et dans le choix des orientations concernant l'utilisation des différentes parties de son territoire, cette forme de participation nous apparaît inadéquate.

Comme vous le savez, au Québec, les projets importants sont habituellement soumis à un processus méthodique d'évaluation et d'examen des impacts sur l'environnement. La liste des catégories de projets assujettis à ce processus est fixée par règlement. Avant la prise de décision finale, une étude détaillée doit être préparée, soumise à la consultation et sur demande à des audiences publiques. Cette procédure a été adoptée pour assurer une prise en compte de tous les aspects des projets dans une perspective de protection maximale de l'environnement. Cette procédure est d'ailleurs parfois citée en exemple.

En reconnaissant cette compétence du Québec en matière de protection de l'environnement sur son territoire, le gouvernement fédéral a déjà accepté dans le passé que certains de ses projets majeurs soient soumis à une forme de procédure conjointe, avec des commissaires nommés par les deux (2) gouvernements et des modalités de fonctionnement choisies en commun. C'est ainsi que les projets du Port Méthanier de Gros Cacouna et de l'extension du Port de Québec avaient été analysés.

Nous estimons que le projet d'accroissement des vols militaires à basse altitude aura des impacts environnementaux qui pourront être majeurs sur environ trente-cinq mille (35 000) kilomètres carrés de territoire québécois et qui pourraient même être extrêmement importants s'il devait y avoir zone de tir, dépendamment de sa localisation, de son étendue et de son degré d'utilisation. Afin de limiter ces impacts et d'y remédier dans toute la mesure du possible, il est primordial que l'étude d'impact soit très approfondie et qu'une fois préparée, elle fasse l'objet d'un examen poussé par des experts et par le public.

Le projet de directive préparé par la Commission d'évaluation environnementale et soumis à la consultation publique actuellement ne nous rassure pas sur la volonté du gouvernement fédéral de minimiser les impacts environnementaux de l'accroissement des vols militaires. Ce projet de directive présente en effet des lacunes majeures. Les questions posées devraient être beaucoup plus précises, notamment sur les sujets suivants.

En ce qui concerne la santé, la directive devrait inclure des questions précises sur les effets psychologiques et physiologiques, notamment auditifs, du bruit, sur les effets indirects reliés à l'emploi de défoliants et autres produits chimiques, sur la qualité de l'air et de l'eau.

Pour ce qui est des impacts sur la faune, l'étude d'impact devrait évidemment mettre l'emphase sur le caribou, estimer les effets probables sur la dynamique du troupeau, sur l'augmentation possible de la mortalité périnatale et sur le stress biologique, distinguer les effets physiologiques à court terme et les effets néfastes à long terme. Toutefois, les autres espèces présentes sur le territoire ne devront pas être négligées. Ainsi, les effets sur le buffle musqué, l'orignal et les poissons devront être amplement documentés. Les effets sur les activités de chasse et de pêche et de piégeage et sur les activités de villégiature de pêche, de chasse et de pêche sportive devront être aussi quantifiés.

Ces analyses devront déboucher sur l'estimation la plus précise possible des pertes d'utilisation du territoire subséquentes à l'accroissement des vols.

L'annexe, dont je vais vous faire part dans quelques minutes, énumère les questions qui, d'après nous, devraient être obligatoirement analysées si on veut que l'étude d'impact permette une évaluation adéquate du projet.

Une fois que cette étude d'impact aura été complétée par le promoteur, elle devrait être examinée par des experts indépendants sur toutes les questions traitées et faire l'objet d'audiences publiques après une période suffisante d'information. Si la révision scientifique de l'étude se révélait trop sommaire, le Québec pourrait alors se voir obligé de procéder à des contre expertises. À tout événement, le Québec souhaite se prononcer sur l'étude d'impact et sur la recommandation de la Commission avant que votre gouvernement ne prenne une décision finale dans le dossier.

Nous sommes conscients des impératifs de la Défense nationale. Cependant, nous tenons à ce que soient minimisés les impacts négatifs du projet, les seuls à se manifester au Québec.

Veuillez agréer, messieurs les ministres, l'expression de mes sentiments les meilleurs."

Et c'était signé par monsieur Clifford Lincoln, ministre de l'Environnement.

Dans le présent dossier, le gouvernement du Québec se préoccupe d'une façon particulière de la santé de la population et de la qualité de son environnement, ainsi que de ses responsabilités comme gestionnaire de la faune. Or, dans sa formulation actuelle, nous considérons que le chapitre traitant des incidences environnementales et socio-économiques que comporte la directive est trop général et n'identifie pas de façon adéquate les points pour lesquels nous désirons obtenir de l'information précise.

Ces lacunes risquent d'amener le

promoteur dans certains cas à ne pas traiter des problèmes jugés importants ou à ne fournir que des réponses évasives, ce qui ne ferait que retarder le processus d'évaluation et nous priver de renseignements essentiels.

Afin d'obtenir l'assurance que nos préoccupations environnementales soient bien comprises et qu'elles soient prises en considération, nous avons identifié les points spécifiques qui devraient être examinés avec plus d'emphase dans ce genre d'étude et pour lesquels nous considérons que des réponses précises devraient être fournies.

Il est à noter que les commentaires que nous formulons s'appliquent à la directive. Ils complètent la directive. Il ne s'agit pas d'une directive en soi. Ça ne précise que certains éléments de la directive en conformité avec la position du gouvernement du Québec.

Le premier point: Bien-être de la population et qualité de son environnement.

Le gouvernement du Québec a comme objectif de favoriser un milieu propice au maintien et à l'épanouissement de la qualité de la vie.

En conséquence, il considère que tous les effets prévisibles directs et indirects sur la santé devraient être étudiés de façon spécifique concernant, entre autres, les points suivants, que nous considérons majeurs:

Les effets du bruit. Les indices retenus pour évaluer le bruit ou le dérangement des populations humaines et animales ainsi que la justification du choix de ces indices par le promoteur;

Deuxièmement, les effets auditifs du bruit. Possibilité de détérioration de l'ouïe ou d'accidents pouvant entraîner une surdité partielle ou totale;

Troisièmement en ce qui regarde le bruit, les effets physiologiques non-auditifs du bruit, sur l'équilibre, s'il y a lieu, sur la fonction cardio-vasculaire, sur les fonctions neuro-endocriniennes;

Et quatrièmement, les effets psychologiques du bruit: Appréhension, peur, stress, anxiété, face aux possibilités de survols inopinés à basse altitude.

Les effets indirects: L'emploi de défoliants et autres produits chimiques en relation avec la santé humaine et animale; la qualité de l'air et de l'eau en fonction de la santé humaine; la flore et la faune en fonction de la chaîne alimentaire; les conséquences du bruit sur les animaux en fonction de l'alimentation de la population.

Et troisièmement, toujours sur le bien-être de la population, les effets des engins de guerre électroniques: Dans le cadre du Centre d'entraînement à l'emploi des armes des chasseurs tactiques ou des accords bilatéraux, l'importance de l'utilisation, dans les avions ou au niveau de stations terrestres, de matériel destiné à la guerre électronique tels que les contre-mesures électroniques, la surveillance électronique, les opérations AWACS et autres, le promoteur devrait préciser, s'il y a lieu, les dangers reliés à l'émission de radiations de ces équipements sur la santé humaine ou sur les animaux.

Deuxième point, en tant que gestionnaire de la faune.

Comme gestionnaire de la faune, les préoccupations du gouvernement du Québec visent plus particulièrement la sauvegarde de la faune, sa protection, son expansion et son exploitation. En conséquence, les sujets qui nous apparaissent les plus importants sont décrits ci-dessous. Par contre, les autres aspects ou ressources fauniques non-mentionnés devront également être analysés, même si ce n'est que d'une façon plus sommaire.

D'abord, le caribou.

Un (1), les troupeaux touchés par le

projet et localisation des terrains de mise bas de chacun.

Deux (2), nombre et migrations de chaque troupeau. Utilisation saisonnière du territoire.

Trois (3), effet du projet sur la dynamique des populations de caribous. Effet possible sur la mortalité périnatale à la suite du stress occasionné par les diverses activités du projet. Évaluation quant au devenir de cette ressource sur le plan de l'accroissement prévisible et en fonction de la modification de certaines des composantes environnementales de son habitat naturel.

Quatre (4), stress biologique suivi au niveau des fonctions cardio-vasculaires et neuro-endocriniennes dans les situations où le caribou ne s'enfuit pas ou dans les situations où le caribou s'affole, l'effet de stampede. Établir, dans les deux (2) cas, le bilan énergétique résultant. Distinguer les effets physiologiques à court terme, augmentation ponctuelle du bilan énergétique, des effets plus néfastes à long terme pouvant affecter la condition physique des animaux et éventuellement leur survie. Considérer en particulier les effets sur la mortalité juvénile qui représente un élément important de la dynamique des populations.

Cinq (5), possibilité ou probabilité

de détérioration de l'ouïe ou d'accident pouvant entraîner une surdité accidentelle, totale ou partielle.

Six (6), possibilité de mise en place par le promoteur, comme mesure de réduction des incidences, d'un système de localisation quotidienne de concentration de caribous afin d'éviter ces zones.

Sept (7), identification des zones où sera effectuée l'exploitation commerciale des caribous, zones de rassemblement, enclos de garde en captivité, abattoirs, et caetera.

Deux (2), le buffle musqué. Effet du projet sur cette espèce récemment introduite et en expansion dans le Nouveau-Québec.

Trois (3), l'orignal. Sur la Côte-Nord, identification des impacts des vols sur le comportement de l'orignal, notamment lorsqu'il est dans ses aires de confinement.

Quatre (4), l'habitat. Effet des défoliants, des retombées provenant de l'échappement des moteurs d'avions et d'autres produits chimiques utilisés par le promoteur sur des végétaux à croissance lente comme les lichens. Mode de transfert de ces produits dans la chaîne alimentaire jusqu'à l'homme, en passant par le caribou et l'orignal.

Les poissons. Possibilités de

pollution de l'eau et de dégradation de l'habitat des poissons en raison des produits chimiques susceptibles d'être retrouvés. On devra tenir compte ici de façon particulière des stocks de saumons d'Atlantique, d'ombles chevaliers et d'ombles de fontaine qui font l'objet d'une récolte importante, soit à des fins de subsistance, soit pour la pêche sportive.

La sauvagine. Même si la gestion des espèces migratrices est soumise à une loi fédérale, le gouvernement du Québec considère qu'il y a lieu de s'assurer de leur protection notamment en déterminant les corridors de migration empruntés et la localisation des habitats importants, plus particulièrement pour la bernache du Canada.

Les animaux à fourrure. Identifier les principales espèces exploitées par les trappeurs et évaluer l'impact des vols sur ces espèces.

Et enfin, un troisième point sur l'utilisation du territoire. L'utilisation du territoire pourrait être limitée, suite à la réalisation du projet. Dans ce contexte, les études devraient être approfondies sur les sujets suivants:

Les activités de chasse et de pêche et de piégeage: Effets du projet sur les activités de prélèvement faunique faites par les autochtones et les allochtones. Localisation des camps et des abris des chasseurs, lieux de chasse exploités.

Les activités de villégiature, de chasse et de pêche sportive: Effets du projet sur les activités de chasse et de pêche sportive et sur la villégiature. Différentes zones et modalités de chasse et de pêche. Localisation et territoires utilisés par les pourvoyeurs. Moyens de transport utilisés. Évaluation de la fréquentation. Risques d'accidents avec les avions de brousse des pourvoyeurs et des avions particuliers.

Et enfin, le tourisme nordique: Identifier les circuits de tourisme d'aventure et leur fréquentation. Mesurer l'impact des vols sur ces activités.

Cet exposé ne concerne que le projet de directive qui fait l'objet de la présente audience publique et cette intervention ne peut et ne doit en aucune façon être interprétée comme une acceptation du projet ou du processus, compte tenu, comme je vous l'ai déjà mentionné, des enjeux importants sur le territoire du Québec, sur la qualité de vie des citoyens susceptibles d'être affectés, sur la protection de l'environnement et sur les ressources fauniques.

Merci, monsieur le Président.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pagé. We have a couple of minutes for questions. Would anybody on the Panel care to ask a question of Mr. Pagé? No. Somebody on the floor would like to ask a question.

PAR MONSIEUR ROBERGE: Oui, j'ai une question. Je pose la question à n'importe qui qui peut me répondre. Bon, mon nom, c'est Gaétan Roberge.

Bon, il y a des gens qui parlent de sauver les caribous, les saumons. D'autres gens veulent sauver d'autres choses. Par exemple, la femme qui a perdu son bébé.

Et puis, ça en est, ça, à mon avis, des études d'impact qui sont réelles. Et puis les militaires semblent avoir dépensé des millions pour poser leurs propres normes, à savoir, bon, juste un cas, à deux (2) reprises, des gens sont arrivés avec des chiffres différents comme huit cents (800) personnes dans un territoire puis les autres en dénombrent dix mille (10 000).

Moi, il faut que je multiplie le huit cents (800) par dix (10) puis que je rajoute un vingt-cinq pour cent (25%) par-dessus ça, pour faire des comparaisons.

Ce que je me demande, c'est qu'avec tout cet argent-là, comment on en vient à ne pas trouver une personne qui sait compter et puis qu'est-ce qu'il y a à comprendre, parce que si vous comparez ça, ça ne se compare pas, ça se contredit.

Ça en devient tellement mêlant que je

ne peux même pas poser la question à savoir qu'est-ce qu'il y a à comprendre dans tout ça.

Pouvez-vous m'indiquer sur quoi vous vous basez pour comprendre ce que les gens apportent, à savoir pourquoi l'armée fait ses études, fixe ses normes, essaie de les rencontrer ses normes et puis pourquoi les gens d'en face... Parce que, enfin, ça revient à ça le débat, je crois, il y a l'armée puis les autres. C'est ce que j'ai compris après-midi.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a very difficult question to answer. I think the best thing to be said is that the Panel has been given a task to do, and it has been given certain terms of reference to follow in doing that.

At the present time we are trying to decide, as a Panel, what instructions to give to National Defence, what are the right questions to ask, what are the right methods to suggest to National Defence to use in writing its impact statement.

I think even part-way through this exercise the Panel would have to agree with you, that we are hearing various kinds of information from various sources and that not all of it appears to be in agreement. I think we are going to have to face this situation and to do our best to sort out all of the information that is given to us now and over the next year and a half or so, and try to make some sense of it all and to come up with some reasonable recommendations to place in our report.

At the present time it is really too early to try to sort out all of the apparent inconsistencies in some of the information that we are receiving. Does that begin to answer your question?

MR. ROBERCE: Yes, it does. All right, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are welcome. Mr. Pagé, thank you very much.

Now, I have a question to pose at the present time --

PAR MONSIEUR CLÉRY: Est-ce que je pourrais poser une question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oui, une question.

PAR MONSIEUR CLÉRY: Une petite question longue de même.

Est-ce que... je l'adresserais au Québec là.

Est-ce que l'on peut considérer... même... on trouve ça curieux. Je vous avoue personnellement là qu'on trouve votre déposition très curieuse. Est-ce que l'on doit considérer, par votre déposition, que vous rejetez complètement toutes les études qu'on vous a demandées au niveau du BAP, par exemple, où on a dit que le ministère de l'Environnement du Québec devrait prendre position dans ce dossier-là. Et comme toute réponse que l'on a, c'est la déposition du gouvernement du Québec ou de son ministère devant une commission qui a refusé que vous vous associiez dans cette étude-là et vous collaboriez...

Permettez-moi, quant à moi là, de me poser de sérieuses questions et est-ce qu'on doit se demander si c'est une réponse officielle à la demande officielle que nous vous avons posée de prendre vos responsabilités?

PAR MONSIEUR PAGE: J'ai bien compris la question.

Dans la lettre de monsieur Lincoln à ses confrères fédéraux, il dit qu'il n'est pas satisfait de la procédure qui est suivie. Il dit qu'il aurait souhaité d'autres choses. Et il est quand même conscient que si le projet doit se réaliser, les données doivent être obtenues.

Et l'intervention que j'ai faite, c'est pour s'assurer que l'étude d'impact va comprendre des éléments qui vont aider soit à implanter des mesures de mitigation, soit à modifier le projet, s'il y a lieu, dans le meilleur esprit pour la protection des citoyens et la protection de l'environnement.

Le ministre, dans sa lettre, spécifie, entre autres, qu'il peut prendre d'autres mesures s'il n'est pas satisfait des études et de l'analyse des études qui va être faite.

Il ne donne pas son accord au projet, loin de là.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pagé. As I said, I have a question to ask the audience at this point. We did hope to finish; that is, to conclude the afternoon session at 5:30 or shortly afterwards. Now, we have had a request from the first speaker scheduled for tonight that he be heard before the dinner break because he has to travel to Québec City tonight. I am wondering if the last speaker scheduled for this afternoon; that is, the Mokami Project Group, if those gentlemen are intending to stay in Montréal tonight, and if so, whether they would be willing to be heard after dinner instead of now.

If not, then we will have to hear from both groups now and carry on through two more presentations and have the dinner break begin later than we intended. I wonder if you would respond, sir?

MR. HENRY SHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I too had planned to leave for Ottawa in about one hour, having come down from Labrador. However, I feel this whole matter is extremely important and I know if we get another speaker now it is going to cut me down to five minutes. I would gladly stay in Montréal, one of my favourite cities, a couple hours longer, and make our presentation after the dinner break. I think that would be very wise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,

sir, and we assure you that you will get your full allotment of time at that time. Thank you.

Then, we will now, before our dinner break, hear from Mr. Alain Méthot, speaking on behalf of L'Association des Pourvoyeurs du Nouveau-Québec.

PAR MONSIEUR MÉTHOT: Bonjour, gens de la Commission. Dans un premier temps, je vais remettre une copie d'une intervention que les pourvoyeurs de la région de Schefferville veulent remettre à la Commission... à l'intention de la Commission, dans laquelle on soulève sept (7) questions qui nous concernent nous autres, quant à l'avenir de nos industries qui dépendent essentiellement de la population de caribous.

Pour clarifier la situation cet après-midi, vous avez eu une intervention, la première à deux heures (2h00), d'un monsieur qui disait avoir le mandat de l'Association des Pourvoyeurs pour venir parler au nom de l'association.

J'aimerais mentionner qu'il s'agit de l'Association des Pourvoyeurs du Québec qui est une entité complètement différente de celle des pourvoyeurs du Nouveau-Québec. C'est simplement pour clarifier la situation, parce que notre position peut peut-être... la nôtre est prête, en tous les cas.

Dans un premier temps, j'aimerais mentionner que notre association, en ce qui concerne les vols à basse altitude, on est en désaccord avec le principe de la tenue de tels vols. En ce qui nous concerne, ce n'est peut-être pas la meilleure solution pour éviter la guerre que de penser à maintenir des armements stratégiques dans notre territoire.

Cependant, les décisions internationales sont à un niveau beaucoup plus élevé que ce qu'on peut faire, nous autres, comme intervention.

L'Association des Pourvoyeurs du Nouveau-Québec est née en quatre-vingt-trois ('83), sauf que depuis mil neuf cent soixante et sept (1967), les pourvoyeurs oeuvrent dans la région de Schefferville.

En quatre-vingt-six ('86), le chiffre d'affaires de nos huit (8) pourvoyeurs membres a atteint les huit (8) millions de dollars. Ça comprend ça, bien entendu, toutes les retombées économiques que les chasseurs peuvent laisser dans la région durant une période d'opérations qui varie entre le quinze (15) juin et le trente (30) septembre.

Ce qui se traduit actuellement par environ deux cent cinquante (250) emplois directs et indirects dans notre région.

Les types d'opérations ont varié beaucoup depuis mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980), depuis le début des vols à basse altitude.

Avant mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980), nos opérations se limitaient dans la région de la rivière George. À ce moment-là, la migration de caribous durait du vingt-cinq (25) août au trente (30) septembre facilement et nos installations qu'on avait sur place suffisaient à accueillir toute la clientèle. Sauf que subitement, dans les années quatre-vingt-un ('81), quatre-vingt-deux ('82), c'est-à-dire après le début des vols à basse altitude, il a fallu aller chercher notre caribou à environ cent (100), cent cinquante (150) milles à l'ouest d'où il était habituellement, avant le début des vols à basse altitude.

Peut-être qu'un biologiste pourrait répondre mieux à dire est-ce que ce sont vraiment les vols à basse altitude qui en sont la raison; on n'a pas... on ne prétend pas avoir toutes les connaissances pour affirmer ça.

Cependant, il y a une chose qu'on aimerait demander à cette Commission, c'est d'abord d'amener soit du gouvernement fédéral ou provincial des argents nécessaires à faire des études supplémentaires. Le vingt-deux (22) juillet dernier, on assistait à une rencontre avec le gouvernement du Québec sur la commercialisation du caribou. À ce moment-là, le gouvernement du Québec avait appelé tous ses éminents spécialistes au niveau du caribou.

Après un après-midi de discussion,

la conclusion où tout le monde en est venu, c'est que personne ne connaissait le caribou encore. On avait beau parler, dire que son habitat était atteint, un autre intervenait en disant que c'était faux.

Finalement, personne ne sait où on en est dans l'état du caribou.

Il serait peut-être, dans un premier temps, nécessaire de connaître c'est quoi ce fameux caribou-là. On avance des chiffres, cinq cent mille (500 000), six cent mille (600 000), trois quarts (3/4) de million; on a besoin de savoir ça avant de dire que les vols à basse altitude peuvent vraiment avoir une conséquence.

Il y a une chose qui est sûre et certaine, j'ai déposé un document à la Commission dans lequel vous verrez des cartes qui démontrent l'aire de distribution, en tous le cas les mouvements de migration depuis mil neuf cent soixante et treize (1973) du caribou, dans la région de Schefferville.

Puis vous serez à même de constater que depuis quatre-vingt-deux ('82), des cartes qui sont disponibles, à ce moment-là, dans la période du mois de juin, vous constaterez que l'aire de mise bas des caribous s'est continuellement éloignée plus au nord. C'est-à-dire pour faire place aux avions à basse altitude.

Est-ce que c'est une coïncidence? On en doute. Cependant, les cartes vous le démontreront. Ce sont des études qui ont été faites par les gens du ministère des Loisirs, Chasse et Pêche.

Par la suite, vous pourrez constater que les migrations de caribous depuis mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980) se font à un rythme, à une rapidité qu'on n'avait jamais vue par le passé.

Avant ça, le caribou se déplaçait lentement; cinq (5), dix (10) milles par jour. Aujourd'hui, c'est trente (30) et quarante (40) milles par jour qu'il circule. Okay, le nombre a augmenté, mais il y a quand même quelque chose qui force les caribous à quitter les côtes du Labrador tôt le printemps. Pour eux autres, les côtes du Labrador, c'est un terrain de pâturage au printemps, là où ils sont le plus vulnérables; ils doivent récupérer l'énergie perdue durant l'hiver.

Et la plus belle preuve, c'est que cette année, nos chasseurs vont avoir abattu environ au-delà de sept mille (7 000) caribous et je peux vous dire que ceux qui ont été tués durant toute la saison de chasse, il n'y avait pas un gros pourcentage de caribous où on pouvait voir un taux de gras normal, c'est-à-dire une épaisseur, une couche de gras qui pouvait être supérieure à un demi-pouce, comme on voyait facilement dans les années soixante et quinze ('75), soixante et seize ('76), on voyait des caribous avec au-delà d'un (1) pouce la couche de gras sur le dos. Ça leur permet, cette couche de gras là, de passer à travers les rigueurs de l'hiver. Cette année, plusieurs mâles adultes dans le coeur de l'âge n'avaient même pas de gras pour prévoir l'hiver.

Est-ce que c'est dû au fait qu'ils quittent les côtes du Labrador trop tôt? En tous les cas, je pense que les biologistes pourraient nous répondre.

Là, on a parlé du caribou, il reste la question économique.

Dans le projet en question, je ne sais pas si ça a été voulu comme ça, mais le gouvernement du Labrador fait une très bonne affaire parce que ce sont eux qui risquent d'encaisser toutes les retombées économiques mais ils partagent les conséquences avec le Québec.

L'intervention qu'on a eue tantôt du gouvernement du Québec, en tous les cas ce n'est pas celle que j'aurais aimé avoir, moi, en tant que résident du Québec. Je me serais attendu à une position peut-être un peu plus ferme en faveur de ceux qui paient des taxes puis des permis puis mettez-en, mettez-en, mettez-en.

Tout ça pour vous dire qu'en conclusion, l'impression ou le "feeling" des pourvoyeurs c'est qu'il est dommage, dans une Commission qui veut s'attarder et faire le tour du problème des vols à basse altitude, qu'on ne voit pas ni du côté des experts conseil, ni du côté des membres de la Commission quelqu'un qui puisse représenter l'industrie touristique nordique, c'est-à-dire pourvoiries, centres de ski, hôtelleries, tous ces gens-là.

C'est un apport économique pour la région qui n'a jamais été à négliger avant que les vols à basse altitude ne commencent, il ne faudrait pas parce que les avions militaires entrent dans le nord qu'on oublie ces gens-là.

Ça fait que, en gros, c'est la position qu'on voulait exprimer à la Commission et on espère avoir une réponse à nos questions le plus rapidement possible. Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, sir, I could just make one immediate response to your last item. We do, indeed, have engaged on behalf of the Panel certain persons who are qualified in the area of social and economic conditions in the Province of Québec and certainly, I would think, within their expertise would be a consideration of the sorts of issues that you have raised.

Now, if you want a more detailed response to that we can arrange for that, but we have not forgotten the sorts of concerns that you have raised.

MR. METHOT: Merci, monsieur le Président. Puis pour la suite, j'espère avoir des nouvelles le plus rapidement possible parce que nos saisons s'en viennent très rapidement. Quatre-vingt-sept ('87) est déjà préparé chez nous.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did I see somebody on the floor who wanted to ask a question of this speaker? No, okay.

Now, I have just been informed that there has been a change of mind on the part of the representatives of the Mokami Project Group. They want to be heard instead now before we break for dinner. This means we will continue on for another 20 minutes and we will see where we stand there with regard to the dinner break.

So, I would invite Mr. Henry Shouse and his colleagues to come forward, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. HENRY SHOUSE, MOKAMI PROJECT GROUP:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This indecision was really not all that difficult, but when you consider the financial loss in giving up a so-called cheap seat ticket to get to Ottawa at a later hour, the cost we soon considered to be horrendous.

My name is Henry Shouse. I am the Mayor of the community of which we all speak, Happy Valley-Goose Bay. I have lived there 36 years and I have one of the most honourable of all professions: I am a school bus driver. I am not a professional speaker or any such thing. I will get on to the presentation as written and, time allowing, I will put on the other remarks.

The opportunities to speak to you on the Draft Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on military flying activity in Labrador and Québec is appreciated by the Mokami Project Group.

The Panel is to be congratulated on the obvious depth and scope of its perception of the issues, as well as its willingness to travel to the far reaches of the country to determine the extent of the impacts the proposed Project will have on such areas as St.John's and Montréal. We, the Mokami Project Group, comprising of the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, the Mokami Regional

Development Association, and the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce, having been funded, at our request, to promote development in Labrador, in general, and currently in Goose Bay, in particular, are very sensitive to the ramifications of this set of hearings and wish to see the Panel conduct them according to their own rules.

We were of the understanding that this initial set of hearings was for discussion of the Draft Guidelines, but having read the transcript from La Romaine, Goose Bay, and Sheshatshit it becomes evident that protest and full-fledged presentations were permitted.

We have come to this set of hearings not prepared to argue the merits of low-level flying activity or economic development, but discuss the ground rules and any problems we might have with the guidelines; not in a confrontational manner, but in hope of clarification. Being very poorly equipped or trained in these matters, as you will find many of the native Labrador groups who will appear before you, we, like them, rely on the basic honesty and respect for authority to try and understand what you are proposing.

Our principal points of concern are ones which we have picked from your draft and which we would like to bring to your attention.

1. It is very pleasing to the Mokami Project Group, that the guidelines apply to the

Shouse, sub.

entire Project right up to the termination and demobilization, because too often the effects of the shutdown of a project can be socially and environmentally more traumatic than any other phase. Labrador has already experienced this trauma several times over: The American Airforce pull-out in 1976; the liner board collapse in 1977; and the Iron Ore down-size in 1982.

The unplanned shutdown or down-sizing tends to have a greater impact on people who have not been prepared or who have not prepared themselves for such an eventuality. To have established a plan for termination of demobilization would greatly ease the hardships, but such a plan would have to include the civilian work force as well as the military on the social guidelines of this plan.

2. On page 27, second paragraph, I quote:

> "The description of the environment must include a survey of the aspirations of the native and non-native residents."

We would like this more fully explained, a clearly defined statement on who are native and non-native, as it relates to this study. It should be noted that the term "native" or "non-native" can quite easily be distinguished in metropolitan areas such as Montréal or St. John's. It is not as easily

Shouse, sub.

done in Labrador. The Inuit, Eskimo, are native Labradorians resident mostly along the north coast. The Innu, Indians, are native Labradorians resident primarily in two communities: Davis Inlet and Sheshatshit. The Métis, or settlers, fourth to seventh generation natives, offsprings of the marriages between the white settlers, the Innu and the Inuit. are resident throughout Labrador. Other natives are sons and daughters of people who have come to Labrador over the past 40 years and driven their roots deep into Labrador's communities and have given to their children the proud heritage of being Labradorians. All of these people are native and would be highly insulted should anyone openly suggest otherwise.

The non-natives are the transients, the military, the short-term construction people, some government officials, some school teachers, some businessmen, and most protesters against development in Labrador of any kind.

3. Under the procedures for the public review, paragraph three, page two, it is stated that the Panel will not accept any information, which cannot be made public. If information of a militarily-sensitive nature might be required under the Draft Guidelines, how would the Panel handle this type of information? Would they not accept data of this nature?

Shouse, sub.

4. Page 22, under infrastructure, the numbers and types of personnel distinguishing between military and civilian personnel required to operate, service and maintain the base.

Our thoughts: To extend this further, it would be required that the personnel identified as essential to the operations, service, and maintenance of the base, should be categorized in such a way that jobs currently being held by the military, or, likely to be held by the military, but are capable of being done by civilians, are identified as such and given civilian preference to the highest possible level and the greatest possible numbers.

This would encourage people to commit themselves and their resources to increased training and advanced education with the added assurance that these types of opportunities will exist.

5. Some concern for fuel transport into Lake Melville and along the coast has been expressed. It is interesting to note that if we were successful in attracting the whole scope of training, that we envision, it would still amount to only about one-half of what we had here in the sixties, on such things as fuel, weaponry and supplies, and much larger quantities have been going through Labrador's transportation lanes for 30 years or more.

Shouse, sub.

One aspect of transportation that does need to be studied is the docking in Tarrington Basin. This area should be adequate to handle freight coming into Goose Bay or being shipped out with a separate and isolated facility for the docking of tankers. Also, to be considered, is the coming Trans-Labrador Highway as the road from Labrador West to Montréal is now open.

Another important area of servicing that we feel will require upgrading is the waste disposal facilities. The capacity to handle all liquid and solid waste as it relates to the Project, not just in terms of oil, sludge, or garbage, but the treatment of sewage within the area. Presently, there is no treatment process but the increased flow and its effect on the river will bear close scrutiny.

The study of facilities and infrastructure should show the requirements of the regional population; not just the military. The capacity of hospitals, schools, and recreational facilities, should be identified along with a general plan as to the locations and accessibility to all residents of the area.

One of the Mokami Project Group's biggest concerns is that Happy Valley-Goose Bay remain an integrated and vibrant community.

In closing, we would like to

Shouse, sub.

compliment the Panel on their diligence and integrity that is shown in drafting the guidelines, and assure them that communities that turn out, small contingents, for Draft Guideline hearings are not doing so out of lack of interest or concern, but, rather, it reflects on the satisfaction that people have regarded the guidelines. Many of the interested groups will be out to the hearings when the proper time has come to present arguments or statements regarding the environmental impact study.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today. Like the cigarette ad: I would rather fight than switch, I would rather speak than read.

I mentioned having been there in Goose Bay 36 years. I, obviously, am white. I am neither ashamed or proud of it. It is just the way I was born. Perhaps, out of European ancestry, but I do not consider myself a drop-in. I did not come by parachute. My grandfather came over from Europe in 1818 when he was 18 years old. My father born in 1844, having fought in the American Civil War to free the blacks, which was also a bloody battle of a much smaller size, but just as bloody and just as bad, became a doctor, settled on the Prairies, and administered to the whites and Indians alike in the 1880s, particularly in the area of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, more likely

Shouse, sub.

made known to the public as the location of the battle of Wounded Knee. One of my other distant relatives, although by marriage, was proof that the Indians do not always lose out; his name was General Custer.

I appreciate the chance to speak to you here and we have several other things I want to pass out. One concern we have is that these hearings, and before that the publicity all of this has been given, we wonder if it is doing more harm than good. The example I have here is the MacLean's magazine of July this year.

Now, I am a white man. Now, this makes me mad; I am not even an Indian. A full-page cover on the tragedy of the Canadian Indian. The tragedy was a brutal reminder of the plight of the Indian people across the land. Now, here we are talking about people who, in the article, mention having been here for 9,000 years, and we are talking about the tragedy of the Indians. Now, there is something desperately wrong and it has nothing to do with aircraft.

In the article it speaks about the typical Indian house: dilapidated, poorly insulated, grimy people -- I say, that would make me mad, because I have a lot of respect for the Indians of Sheshatshit. I have hired a lot of them; I have worked along with them, and I find this

Shouse, sub.

article a pure insult.

However, it does point out that there is a social problem that has to be faced. Now, whether that comes under the category of this Panel, I would not want to say, but it is the kind of information that is sent out to the public that is completely misleading, erroneous and many times outright lies. No wonder the average Canadian across the country is very confused on the whole issue.

I have an article here, a re-print from a paper in 1882. I am a little hesitant to present it to the Panel because on first glance you could say it is entirely irrelevant and in one way it is. It is a birthday greeting from a company in Labrador, and it says:

> "Thank you Labradorians for assisting this company in reaching our 30th year of continuous operation. Our goal in 1952 was to hire only Labradorians. For the most part, this we have done. We have also accomplished a lot more ...",

and the article goes on, and on the sides it gives a list of some of the projects. All of the ones that the Indians were involved in the crew are circled.

We talk about the Indian culture.

Shouse, sub.

You know that term is being used so erroneously nowadays. What is culture? It is the way we live today. Heritage is cast in stone; the way our fathers and grandfathers lived. Culture is the way we live today and that is constantly changing.

The Indians of Sheshatshit shop in the Co-op, drive cars, watch colour television. They are not that much different. Where they do vary and where they are different is in the way they make their living.

If you notice here, there is a big list of jobs and the reason I am pointing that out because at Sheshatshit. I heard them say we will only get the trivial jobs, the meaningless ones. That is not true. They are capable of doing many things, and not only capable but these downtrodden Indians, that this article talks about, have opportunities for education that none of your children have unless you are mighty rich. In Newfoundland and Labrador, they can go to school free. They get their airfare free. They get their books free. The tuition, their travel, their board, everything free. They have the capability of becoming anything they want to be, but they have to want to be that.

Now, one of the recent questioners was wondering about these -- and I think he has gone -- he contradicted the figure 800 and 1,000.

Shouse, sub.

I know for a fact that 800 is the population of the Indians in Labrador, give or take -- well, I will say 100 to be very, very safe. There just are not that many Indians in Labrador. They are only in two communities. One has about 500; one has about 300. Five and three is eight. So, I'm wrong; so, it is 900. The Indian population is very, very low there.

They have had the opportunity since Goose Bay started, having lived only about 25 miles away, to have every opportunity in the past 42 years to work, to become steadily employed. No one has taken advantage of it. Several work part-time in the summer and then draw their UIC in the winter. They simply have not come into the lifestyle that we have.

But now you say, or, you might think, well, they do not want to, but the thing is, they are being given money, they are being paid for doing nothing. They do not have to go trapping. There are more furs caught, and anybody can write this down that wants to, by white -- I will say --

because to me it is all inclusive, Labradorians than there are by the Indians in the same country that we have been discussing all afternoon.

The Lake Joseph caribou herd on the south-west Labrador and on the Québec border was almost wiped out a few years ago. It just about

Shouse, sub.

went down to nothing. There was not one jet around. It was so badly overhunted they had to put a complete ban on hunting. That is almost enough to drive caribou anyplace and there is not an airplane around there.

We heard some talk about this military, and do not think I am military; do not think I am war-like, because if I had my way I would outlaw bodychecking in hockey and that would knock the hell out of the Canadians. However, they talk about live bombing areas in Labrador, which are in a very confined area. Labrador West uses 49 million pounds of explosives every year in their mining operation. Now, they are going to completely destroy that little hill where the iron ore is or was.

The bombing range, which I dare say compared to those figures, would be in thousands of pounds, certainly -- I would not say hundreds but I would say, thousands of pounds and not millions -- all they are going to do is put the dirt from one side to another. I have seen the areas up there. They are completely devoid of any trees. It is barren and there is simply nothing there, including people.

I have taken, I am sure, my allotment. I will ask my partner here, Councillor Brett, if he would like to make a few comments.

---SUBMISSION BY COUNCILLOR BRETT: If I might, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to say how pleased I am to be in this great city and to see so many people interested in Labrador and Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

I do not say it facetiously, but I wonder, after listening to all the comments, what purpose it all serves and one of the problems with this forum that we are at today, Mr. Chairman, and I say it with all due respects and without prejudice, that this forum seems to have become a seminar on politics of peace, and we have a real problem with that because we understood that environmental aspects of these hearings is what is to be dealt with.

We would like to ask you in your deliberations as a Panel, that when we get down to the real issues and discuss the environmental aspects in the next set of hearings that somehow a thing will be set up, or some sort of a format, so that we can discuss the real concerns of what this Panel is all about, and that is not to debate war and peace, but to debate the real issues of our concerns.

We in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, in Labrador, are very concerned about the publicity and some people ask: Why did we come to Montreal when you were in Goose Bay? That is one of the problems. I mean we are the good guys, or, we

Brett, sub.

perceive ourselves; we wear the white hats, and we have a real problem with the bad publicity that we are getting regarding being war mongers and all that garbage that we get on it. We have listened to some of it here today, and I have to say it bothers me when I hear people talking about laying down their arms when we had two wars and people went to a slaughterhouse unprepared, and here we are providing the forum and I take advantage of your generosity, Mr. Chairman, seeing you gave it to other people, to get my crack in, that find that maintaining peace is to be strong and that is military development.

And, it is not what some people make of it: A few jobs and a few dollars. We are all quite self-sufficient in the Goose and in Labrador, many of us are, and we do not need it, but we see it as our contribution.

The other concern that is raised is the Innu thing and we are neighbours to the community of Sheshatshit and myself and the Mayor, I guess, are the only, really, two people in this room who have been here all day that are directly affected by this proposed development, and I think the only ones really to speak knowledgeably about it, although with all due respects to our Québec friends, the Innu are very good friends of ours, and we do not want to get into a hassle, and it

Brett, sub.

tends to be that. People seem to be trying to line up the Innu against the white man and I think that is a very sad situation, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to see that this Panel somehow takes action that this does not happen because the Innu -- and we recognize the fact and I think they recognize -- have a social problem, but it cannot be confused with military development.

I mean I have heard it all when I heard a man today say, that acne was as a result of low-level flying. I mean that is absolutely crazy and ludicrous, that to blame acne among the Innu on low-level flying or infer that it came from that. That is the type of garbage, and I say, garbage, because it has never been substantiated -- anything that has come from the people who purport to support that -- have come to any conclusions or substantiated anything in their case, because we have lots of people in Labrador who use the country and never have any problems with this low-level flying that we have on the go here.

So, these are the concerns, Mr. Chairman, and I respect the time, but these are the things I guess we want to get off our chest and impart to you is, that we want to try and see this format kept in a proper way as we are discussing Draft Guidelines, that when you formulate the guidelines that this Panel, with all respect,

Brett, sub.

restrict and maintain and keep the topic to the guidelines or what the topic is that we are addressing. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brett and Mr. Shouse.

In response to your last comment, sir, I might just say that the Panel is still in a bit of a learning process in this review; it is at a very early stage, and we take note of your comments with regard to, perhaps, the procedures in future meetings that the Panel may hold in public.

We are so close to 6:00 o'clock, we might as well continue on until that time. I suspect that this presentation might have been the cause for some questions or comments. Would anyone care to say something at this point in the next three or four minutes? Yes, sir, go ahead.

MR. ERIK POOLE: If I could just ask a question to the representatives from Mokami. Was I to imply by your remarks in terms of the Innu reticence about taking on full-time employment at the Goose, that you are in fundamental disagreement with the values of native culture, and that you feel that the natives have some learning to do and that they should learn our production consumption-oriented values? Is that what you are saying?

MR. SHOUSE: No, do not misunderstand me. I was at the hearing at Sheshatshit. I heard two voices there out of all the speakers. There was the older people, who are obviously in the minority; unlike, I suppose the whites where the older seem to be getting in the majority -- the older people were saying, some of them now, here, we have been here for generations; we want to hunt and trap in peace, but what was the Band Council, Daniel O'Sheeney, Chairman of the Naskapi-Sheshatshit Band Council, what was he saying?

We should not have these hearings yet until our land claims are settled. Now, what are land claims? It was not that they wanted to claim the land. They want to settle their land claims, which is different, so they are assured, and this is no secret or anything else, of payment in exchange for our use of the land. It is very obvious. They want, and I am not saying they do not deserve or should not get -- they want to be assured of a certain amount of money; not this year or not just next year. The James Bay Agreement I think would be some indication of that, because the young people are not going off living in the country like many of you are led to believe.

MR. POOLE: May I address a supplementary question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, go ahead, please.

MR. POOLE: My question really had to do with values, and I am going to be really arrogant, if you will just permit me for the sake of argument.

As a young English Canadian born and raised in central Canada, I would tend to agree with your infamous Cabinet Minister -- help me, his name -- John Crosbie, that people in Newfoundland and Labrador should stop harping and they should recognize just how well off they are compared to Third World countries --

MR. SHOUSE: I am glad you agree with him, because we do not.

MR. POOLE: Yes, and that, perhaps, the problems you are having in Newfoundland and Labrador are that you have not adopted the values of English Canadians in central Canada. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to respond to that, Mr. Shouse?

MR. SHOUSE: I do not think there is any point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we can entertain any more questions now. Thank you very much. Mr. Brett?

MR. BRETT: I really did not get the point. I mean, you are talking about lifestyles. We are familiar with the lifestyles of the Innu and the lifestyles of paid charter by the federal government into the country and they spend three months in there -- that is some of the newer ones; some of the real Innu, who do their trapping and hunting, you hardly ever hear from them, but the radical crowd, and if this is what this gentleman is referring to, and I do not know, but their lifestyle is they have a paid charter into the country to come out after three months with very few skins with maybe half a case of toilet paper and a few cases of canned goods, if you want to be facetious about it.

We try to stay away from this type of stuff, but if this is the values that this gentleman is adhering to, we know all about the values and there is no one in this room or across Canada can tell us anything about the values of the people -- of some of those people, I should say -- in those communities. That is the garbage that has been propagated through the country and that is the stuff that we are getting annoyed with and are going to put an end to. Thank you.

MR. SHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I must make one more comment, if I can. I have a son who went to university in St. John's and studied wildlife biology, and came back with a degree. At the same time a young Indian was in St. John's going to the same university. Where is my son now? He is off up in the country trapping. Where is the Indian? He is part of the protest group.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shouse. We will now break for dinner and we will begin again at 7:30 rather than 7:00 o'clock, and that will be 7:30 sharp. Thank you very much. We will see you at 7:30.

---Dinner adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: I apologize for starting late. The restaurant just would not co-operate.

So, for this evening's session, we have already heard from the first scheduled speaker before dinner, and the next on the list is the Town of Schefferville. Is there somebody here to speak on behalf of Schefferville? Somebody has indicated to me that, perhaps, there was no one after all. I assume we will not hear from Schefferville this evening then.

In that case then, we have had a request from one of the later speakers to be moved forward in the order of presentations, because he has a commitment later in the evening. So, I will now call upon Mr. Conrad Sioui, Assemblée des Premières Nations.

PAR MONSIEUR SIOUI: Bonsoir monsieur le Président, bonsoir membres du comité permanent, du comité d'étude, bonsoir tout le monde.

Avec moi, monsieur Dany Gaspé qui est le directeur des relations parlementaires à l'Assemblée des premières Nations du Canada.

Mon nom est Conrad Sioui, je suis le vice-chef qui représente la région du Québec à l'Assemblée des premières Nations du Canada.

Nous avons eu le plaisir de passer devant le Comité permanent de l'environnement et des forêts il y a de ça environ un (1) an, en octobre quatre-vingt-cinq ('85). Nous avons eu aussi le plaisir de nous faire entendre au Comité permanent des Affaires indiennes, il y a de ça quelques mois.

À ce moment-là, j'étais accompagné du chef de La Romaine, le chef Basile Bellefleur, ainsi que d'un conseiller, monsieur Guy Bellefleur, de La Romaine également.

Ce soir, ça nous fait plaisir de venir vous adresser un petit peu les questions qui sur un plan en ce qui concerne l'Assemblée des premières Nations, c'est-à-dire l'organisation nationales des indiens du Canada, les questions qui nous préoccupent plus spécialement, tant sur le plan technique que sur le plan de l'étude elle-même ou de ses effets.

Je ne pense pas que ce soit la place aujourd'hui... ce soir, pour parler des effets négatifs que l'on a entendus au cours des témoignages du chef Bellefleur et de monsieur Guy Bellefleur aussi. Et des effets négatifs non seulement sur la faune ou sur la flore, mais surtout sur le genre humain, c'est-à-dire les personnes qui sont affectées par les activités militaires à basse altitude au-dessus du territoire que l'on dit Ntesinan, c'est-à-dire le territoire traditionnel des Innus Montagnais.

J'ai moi-même participé à une expédition lorsque le chef Bellefleur m'a demandé de me rendre, au nom de l'Assemblée des premières Nations du Canada, sur les territoires qui sont au nord de La Romaine, dans le Ntesinan.

Je suis parti avec cinq (5) conseillers, cinq (5) chefs qui siègent au conseil de La Romaine et aussi un conseiller de Natashquan et on a été rejoint aussi par deux (2) membres de la communauté Sheshashit, dans le Labrador.

Et pendant cinq (5) jours, j'ai vécu une expérience, j'ai vu des choses, j'ai senti des choses, j'ai réalisé des choses sur le territoire. J'ai eu aussi peur des avions militaires à basse altitude, même si je ne les ai pas vus, j'ai eu aussi peur qu'eux d'en voir ou d'en ressentir les effets.

Donc, mon expérience pendant cinq (5) jours sur ce territoire-là a été concluante. J'ai vu des oeufs de canard craqués, cassés, des petits canards morts suite, probablement, aux effets du son... le choc du son. J'ai vu des castors extrêmement maigres qui ne sortaient pas le soir, parce que des castors normalement en santé... je suis un indien moi-même, je suis un Huron, je connais la nature, je sais que des castors en santé, c'est gras et des castors en santé ça sort vers cinq heures (5h00) du soir pour commencer à pratiquer leur travail pendant une partie de la soirée.

Donc, j'ai vu des castors extrêmement maigres qui ne sortaient à peu près pas ou très très tard le soir, effrayés. J'ai vu des chasseurs avec des tympans d'oreille qui avaient été défoncés et qui avaient dû être hospitalisés d'urgence à Goose Bay puis par la suite amenés à Saint-John à Terre-Neuve.

J'ai vu aussi dans ce voyage-là une occupation du territoire qui était phénoménale. C'est-à-dire des camps de chasseurs avec toute leur famille, avec les vieux - les vieux et les jeunes, les enfants - donc, des unités familiales complètes qui occupaient le territoire de façon totale, c'est-à-dire qu'on connaît très bien qu'un chasseur a besoin d'une superficie extrêmement vaste de territoire pour qu'il puisse survivre lui, sa famille et les siens.

Donc, j'ai vu une occupation du territoire qui était totale. Ou, semble-t-il, en ce qui me concerne, qui semblait vraiment totale. Le territoire était occupé.

J'ai vu aussi sur le plan des humains eux-mêmes une peur extrême de la part des enfants d'abord et de la part des femmes aussi, une peur extrême de se faire surprendre par des avions réactés de la nature dont on parle.

Une peur aussi, en plus, sérieuse de voir ces avions-là larguer des bombes ou des semblants de bombes ou des... pratiquer des activités militaires qui laisseraient tomber des objets sur le territoire. Donc, ça, ça effrayait les gens aussi.

J'ai vu aussi des poissons qui n'étaient pas encore morts mais qui flottaient au-dessus de l'eau, sur les lacs, et qui avaient des taches rouges près des nageoires.

J'ai pris des photos de ça aussi et si vous vouliez les voir, ça me fera plaisir de vous faire parvenir ces photos-là que j'ai prises au mois d'octobre quatre-vingt-cinq ('85), c'est-à-dire il y a environ un (1) an.

Donc, une expérience extrêmement enrichissante, en ce qui me concerne, d'avoir visité le territoire, d'être allé voir de facto, de visu, ce territoire-là qui était totalement occupé, comme je le dis, et une expérience en même temps très malheureuse de voir des gens qui habitent le territoire à l'année et qui, s'il fallait que ces activités militaires là se poursuivent au rythme où elles semblent vouloir se poursuivre, c'est-à-dire en grandissant, ça serait, sans aucun doute, selon moi, un génocide.

C'est ce que, dans mon langage, j'appelle un génocide. C'est une facilité aberrante, rapide de détruire un mode de vie qui opère depuis des millénaires, des dizaines de millénaires et des centaines de millénaires et qui, de façon extrêmement rapide, vient compromettre la vie de ces gens-là qui, comme vous le savez, n'ont pas d'autre façon de survivre que de pratiquer un mode de vie traditionnel qui en même temps est en soi un mode de vie où on exprime une fierté, une richesse culturelle et on exprime une capacité de se prendre en charge et de s'auto-suffire.

Donc, pour moi, l'auto-suffisance est aussi l'auto-détermination des indiens. C'est une façon très totale de s'auto-suffire et de s'autodéterminer, plutôt que d'en faire des personnes qui vont mendier un chèque de bien-être ou de mieux-être.

Donc, sans plus tarder, moi, je laisserais la parole à monsieur Dany Gaspé pour qu'il poursuive. Je reviendrai par la suite. Merci.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DANNY GASPE:

Thank you very much. My name is Dan Gaspé. I am a Mohawk from the community of Ganasitaki, in Québec. I have also been working as Parliamentary Relations Advisor to the Assembly of First Nations for several years, and the Innu and Montagnais people have asked us to do everything in our power to help them come to a resolution on this issue.

At a national level, the Assembly of First Nations comprised of a majority of the chiefs of the Indian Bands from across the country, have passed numerous resolutions in support of the Innu people and in respect of the general militarization of aboriginal territories across Canada.

I refer to events happening in the north in the Territory of the Dénéde Nation, where there is Cruise missile testing going on, and as an another example in the interior of British Columbia where there is also low-level tests going on.

I should mention that I am giving a general background of the issue as a national issue and as a political issue before getting down to the question at hand right here, which is the guidelines that you, as a Panel, must set.

At the present time, the Assembly of First Nations is negotiating with the provincial and federal levels of government at the Constitutional

Gaspe, sub.

table in good faith on the key questions of political rights of the First Nations and the controls of lands and resources. The effect of low-level flights over Nitassinan and the lands of the Innu and Montagnais are affecting the rights now recognized in the Constitution; that is, the existing aborginal and treaty rights.

It has been a general legal opinion, that we have heard often, that existing aborginal and treaty rights are only protected by the Constitution insofar as they are deemed to be existing or practiced. The effect of low-level flying is basically driving families off the land in their traditional pursuits, and, therefore, in the opinion of many legal advisors, it is questionable whether the Constitution would actually protect their rights.

There are land claims negotiations going on across the country with different First Nations, which generally set some detail to the relationship of those nations with Canada. The effect on land claims in the area in question, that you are studying, could affect the validity of a claim should the Innu ever decide to put forward a claim. At the present time I understand that that is not their position, but should they ever want to put in a land claim to the federal government, the question of them not being on the land, living

Gaspe, sub.

off the land, could affect their validity. What I mean by that is, that the federal claims policy at this time has a criteria for acceptance of negotiation, that the people be in fact practicing their traditional pursuits on the land from time immemorial.

One other effect could be the actual settlement of claims. Consideration of selection of lands.

However, the most important effect is on the humans themselves and the culture of the Innu and Montagnais people. I think the bottom line in land claims and the Constitutional discussions that we are involved in is obtaining the informed consent of the aboriginal First Nations involved in any development or any projects that affect their territory and their culture.

In terms of the guidelines for the drafting of an Environmental Impact Statement, we are concerned that that effect on health -- we are not sure whether that would be covered. We would like some feedback on that at this time. We observed the Interim Report of the Public Health Association this past summer, which ignored many of the materials available on the health effects of similar experiences on people in other parts of the world.

We have a question as well on the issues to be looked at by the Panel. We notice that

Gaspe, sub.

Panel in the Draft Guidelines will be looking at the outcome of land claims negotiations. However, we are not sure who is going to be doing that assessment. We would like some comment on that.

On the question of the terms of reference of the Panel, we find ourselves in somewhat of a dilemna because somewhere, somehow, the rights of the Innu and Montagnais must be considered in this whole Project, their political rights, their rights over their territory. There are no other processes at this time, to my knowledge, available to consider those issues.

My reading of the terms of reference of this review is that they would not be included. However, the dilemna is, whether we should be recommending that the question of political rights be included or not. It is a hard one, because on one hand it should be looked at; on the other hand, whether this is the Panel that should be looking at it, we are not sure.

One suggestion we would have is that any materials produced by the Department of National Defence or any other group putting together reports or research for this Panel be easily and readily available to the Innu and any of their agents.

To sum up before I give it over to Conrad, I think in my experience as Parliamentary

Gaspe, sub.

Relations for the Assembly of First Nations, I have run across a recurring myth amongst most Canadians, and that is, the ethnocentric view that most Indians living traditionally off the land want to come into the so-called 20th century and leave the bush life. I think that you have already had some evidence from the Montagnais and Innu that that is not the case and it is wrong to assume that those people, in fact, would trade what are called the benefits of 20th century for the bush life. Thank you.

PAR MONSIEUR SIOUI: Monsieur le Président, j'ai juste jeté un regard ce soir sur le rapport C.P.H.A., le "task force", Canadian Public Health Association, et puis je peux vous dire que dans ce rapport-là, on ne retrouve pas vraiment une analyse systématique de la situation vraiment.

C'est un rapport qui a été téléguidé d'avance, selon mes termes à moi; donc, qui visait un objectif et qui l'a atteint.

On aurait nous-mêmes proposé une étude où on aurait téléguidé la conclusion et on aurait fait la même chose, mais de façon extrêmement différente de ce qui ressort dans ce rapport-là.

Prenons l'exemple... si, supposons, la communauté de Goose Bay, les non-autochtones de Goose Bay, s'il fallait un jour que, à l'exemple de la ville de Gagnon, ou il y a d'autres villes nordiques qui ont été abandonnées, s'il fallait que la ville de Goose Bay soit un jour abandonnée faute de travail pour les non-autochtones, ces personnes-là auraient toujours la capacité, l'habilité aussi, de se resituer dans un autre village, dans un autre environnement, dans une autre ville, afin de trouver du travail.

Ce n'est absolument pas le cas, et j'insiste sur ça, ce n'est absolument pas le cas pour les habitants autochtones de cette région-là.

Ces personnes-là ne peuvent absolument pas se resituer nulle part ailleurs. Dû au mode de vie qu'ils pratiquent et dû aussi au fait que les territoires ancestraux qu'ils occupent et dont ils tirent leur subsistance sont à eux de père en fils ou de mère en fille, et caetera. Donc, ils ne peuvent pas être aussi facilement amenés à vivre ailleurs ou à pratiquer une autre façon de travailler ou de gagner leur subsistance.

Le dernier point: Pourquoi est-ce qu'aujourd'hui on parle du Labrador et du Nord du Québec et pourquoi est-ce qu'il y a des activités militaires au-dessus de ces territoires-là? Je pense qu'au départ, on a pensé, on a cru que ces territoires-là étaient vierges. Non seulement vierges, mais inoccupés. On a cru que ces territoires-là ne dérangeraient le moins de personnes possible. Le fait que le Québec ne soit pas propriétaire du Labrador, en terme de territorialité, le fait que Terre-Neuve vient tout juste à peine de s'occuper un peu de ce territoire-là. Donc, c'était un territoire qui était propice au ministère de la Défense, probablement, pour pratiquer des activités militaires.

Sauf qu'on s'est aperçu, puis on

s'aperçoit de plus en plus que ce territoire-là est vraiment habité et qu'il y a beaucoup, beaucoup de personnes, d'indiens qui pratiquent un mode de vie traditionnel et qui vont à l'intérieur de ce territoire-là à l'année longue.

Donc, c'était mon dernier commentaire, si vous voulez, peut-être pour préciser des choses.

Si vous avez des questions, on est prêt à répondre à toute question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen. There were two points raised by Mr. Gaspe, to which I would like to respond briefly.

You questioned, sir, whether health effects are covered in our guidelines and, I believe, that, in fact, they are under issue number one listed on page 13 of the English version of the draft. Section 5, the issues:

> "The effects of low-flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife."

We certainly believe that those effects on humans would have to include consideration of health effects; not only physical health effects, but also psychological. Does that answer your question on that point?

MR. GASPE: Yes, it does, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question of who will assess effects on the outcome of land claims negotiations, the EIS will, of course, be prepared by the Department of National Defence. They will engage whatever expertise they feel would be necessary to meet the requirements laid out in the guidelines for this and all of the other issues to be addressed.

Do you have any other question beyond that?

MR. GASPE: I would like to know whether this Panel has any authority to consider other sources of assessment of the question of land claims other than through the Department of National Defence?

THE CHAIRMAN: As in any other review of this sort, the Panel does not have to depend solely on the content of the Environmental Impact Statement. That, after all, is a statement of the proponent, and is recognized as such.

We can go to -- that is, the Panel can go to any other sources that it wishes. If we find it necessary to do so, we could engage particular expertise on a contract-basis to advise the Panel on that matter just as we have on several others already.

So, we are not restricted to accepting unquestionably the content of the impact statement.

MR. SIOUI: Yes, I have maybe two questions. The first one would be to ask if you looked at recommendation number three of the Standing Committee on Environment in Forestry, recommendation number three, which calls for -- well, I read it in French:

PAR MONSIEUR SIOUI: Le ministère de la Défense nationale devrait mettre fin immédiatement à tous les vols militaires en rase-motte au-dessus de la Côte-Nord et du Labrador.

Le ministre devrait faire évaluer les répercussions de tels vols sur l'environnement dans ces régions et ce, dans les plus brefs délais.

Je ne sais pas si vous avez regardé cette recommandation-là, qui est la recommandation numéro trois (3) du Standing Committee, suite à nos représentations.

Et à ma deuxième question, question plutôt technique, je m'aperçois qu'à la table vous avez uniquement un (1) autochtone. Je suis surpris de voir qu'il y a peut-être une représentation autochtone trop faible sur votre comité et surpris aussi de voir que... non pas que... d'abord que monsieur Jourdain... je pense que monsieur Jourdain, tout le monde le connaît. Monsieur Jourdain est extrêmement compétent, mais j'aurais voulu voir aussi, peut-être, d'autres monsieurs Jourdain sur le comité. C'est-à-dire peut-être même des personnes du Labrador, de Sheshashit, des Innus du Labrador.

C'était une observation plus qu'une question celle-ci, mais une observation qui s'avère être, je pense, judicieuse.

Donc, peut-être ma première question, qui parlait de la recommandation numéro trois (3), si vous l'avez regardée puis qu'est-ce que vous allez en faire? Si ça vaut la peine d'en faire quelque chose.

THE CHAIRMAN: We certainly are aware of the existence of that recommendation and it has been brought to our attention already two or three times in previous meetings.

What we said before in response to the suggestion in connection to that is, that the Panel might seek a moratorium on the military activity until the review is finished and we will consider that recommendation along with others related to the mandate of the Panel in the month of November when the Panel meets to work out the final form of the guidelines.

The Panel will decide what to do about those recommendations and once we get the guidelines finished and out of the way, so-to-speak, those being the most important thing now, we would publish some sort of announcement indicating the Panel's response to these various questions that have been put to us during these meetings. So, we will consider the question of a moratorium along with certain other questions at that time.

MR. SIOUI: When will you consider the question of a moratorium?

THE CHAIRMAN: After these meetings are over at the end of October, the Panel will meet during the month of November to work out the final form of the guidelines, and at that same time we will consider these questions and suggestions that have come from the public.

MR. SIOUI: Thanks,monsieur le président.

THE CHAIRMAN: On your second concern about native representation on the Panel, I am not sure that Mr. McNeill would entirely agree with you about the absence of native representation from Labrador. Would you care to say something about that, Tim?

MR. McNEILL: I think if you remember what Mr. Shouse -- the comment that Mr. Shouse made with respect to native people in Labrador, I am a person who has lived in Labrador for all my life, except for a short period when I was away to school. I have lived along with Inuit people. We practice very much the same lifestyle as they do, and I think you run into a lot of problems when you try to separate settler people like myself from Inuit people.

I was recommended by the Labrador Inuit Association, that I have a lot of contact with, and I think that I bring some expertise to this Panel on their concerns.

MR. SIOUI: So, Mr. McNeill, if I can ask, Mr. President, I am really, really sure, that you will agree totally with me that the militarization of the north and that low-level flights should end right now today. I mean, tonight.

MR. McNEILL: We have not travelled in northern Labrador. I have opinions of my own and

I know of opinions of other people there. However, I would not like to speak and say what they feel until I first listen to them.

THE CHAIRMAN: One more thing that I would like to add with regard to your comment that it would have been nice to have representation of the interests of the Labrador Innu on the Panel. Yes, that might, indeed, have been a nice thing to have. However, when the Innu of Sheshatshit and Labrador were invited to nominate one or two persons for the Minister's consideration before the appointment of the Panel, that they declined to do so. The effort was made.

MR. SIOUI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, I understand, Mr. McNeill, you do not talk on behalf of the Innu from Labrador and on the question that I asked you, you have some reserves. Thank you, Mr. McNeill.

MR. GASPE: I would like to add one more point to this discussion. I think that under the heading of socio-economic impacts, I think that whoever is doing the report to the Panel on this should consider, as a comparison, what would happen in case of the total decline of the cultures and communities of the Innu and Montagnais as a result of any development of this Project, compared to the culture and survival of the culture of the Canadian or Quebecois culture, assuming that there might be a decline in the Goose Bay community.

What I am getting at there is that the Innu and Montagnais have one homeland which is in that area. There are a limited number of communities. If there is to be a decline in their culture and their way of life, they have no other homeland to return to to ensure that survival.

However, that is not the case with the community of Goose Bay or other non-native communities. I think that should be something that be looked at carefully in considering the socio-economic impacts.

On the question of land claims, that was discussed earlier, I think that strong consideration should be given to engaging expertise other than through the Department of National Defence, and that I am sure in discussions with us you would be able to get a good selection of people who can give you a good idea of what might be involved in the effect on land claims and the political rights of the Innu and Montagnais.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I believe Major McCabe would like to ask a question or say something.

MAJOR McCABE: Just for clarification with the translation. Mr. Sioui, you mentioned during your stay in the country with the Innu you said first of all, that you were in the northern training area, what we call the northern training area?

MR. SIOUI: Well, Major McCabe, first of all, I am happy to know you. I have been talking to you on the phone but --

MAJOR McCABE: Correct.

MR. SIOUI: Yes, I was -- well, to tell you the truth I was in Nitassinan.

MAJOR McCABE: That is not the question I asked you, sir.

MR. SIOUI: I might have been on the first -- I was, you know, you take a plane from La Romaine and you travel up north, mais, I would say one hour, so you arrive --

MAJOR McCABE: No, it is no problem. It is just that you mentioned the northern area and I just wanted to differentiate purely for the record that is all. I am curious. If you went with the La Romaine band you were probably in the northern part of the southern area, I assume. Anyway that is part of the question.

You mentioned that during your stay -- again, I am concerned about translation here -- you mentioned that you saw hunters with their eardrums pierced and that they were taken out and treated at the hospital at Goose Bay; was that it?

MR. SIOUI: Maybe to tell you that in English, I was with five councillors of La Romaine. One of them was Councillor Charles Bellefleur. Because Mr. Charles Bellefleur talks French also, he was telling me right on the spot that he himself experienced the fact that a plane, a low-level plane, came right above his camp and he did not have time to turn his head because you really have to turn your head because the sound comes after the plane passes. So the plane is passed but you really have to watch because the sound is going to come, because it is faster than the sound of flight.

So, anyway Mr. Bellefleur had his eardrum -- I do not know, broken -- broken is not the right term but -- burst, and it really hurt, as he was saying, and then he had to be taken to the hospital in Goose Bay and then moved to Newfoundland, St. John's, I guess, so that he could have his eardrum repaired. He told me that he was not the only one that suffered from these kind of low-level flights.

MAJOR McCABE: So, this did not actually happen while you were there, though? That is why I am trying to clarify the translation because I heard in English, that you had seen hunters with their eardrums pierced and treated at the hospital. Is that correct or not?

MR. SIOUI: I have seen the hunter, yes.

MAJOR McCABE: But that happened while you were there in the country?

MR. SIOUI: I think I made it very clear before that I did not see it. I was there and I looked at him having his eardrum burst and, I think, that happened once and now at the time he was with me he recovered from that. To which degree, I do not know how he recovered, but I know he recovered at least to be able to go back in the bush.

MAJOR McCABE: So, I can assume that as he was treated in hospital at Goose Bay that there would be medical records there of that then?

MR. SIOUI: Yes, that is for sure, because he was transported there by helicopter.

MAJOR McCABE: Okay, the second question I had was --

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Major, is this going to be long, because I think in all fairness to the other speakers we should get on.

MAJOR McCABE: No, sir. Just again, sir, I am concerned for translation purposes here.

You mentioned the concern of the women about bombs dropping.

MR. SIOUI: Pardon me?

MAJOR McCABE: You mentioned the women in the camps were afraid of bombs dropping.

MR. SIOUI: I was very surprised to listen to women and to kids being so afraid that they thought they were in the middle of a war, like in Iran, for example; Iraq, or in Australia, or in Nicaragua -- any part of the world where there is low-level flights, bombing, and even if it is not real bombs I guess just the fact that you talk about bombing the area, it is enough to make people afraid; even myself. Maybe not yourself but I am sure if you would be with me in the bush with these people, I guess you would be afraid also too to see that.

MAJOR McCABE: That was my concern, the seeing. Was it just a fear of, or did they see them?

MR. SIOUI: What I have seen I have told you what I have seen and I have told you what I have heard, and what I have seen is that I have seen the people and I have seen game; that I have seen, and I told the Chairman that I have pictures, if you really want to see these pictures. I took them myself.

MAJOR McCABE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Mr. Gérald McKenzie representing a coalition of several groups here in the Province. I am sure he will explain those to you when he begins his presentation. Mr. McKenzie.

PAR MONSIEUR McKENZIE: Je vous remercie de nous entendre.

Je suis ici à titre de président de la Ligue des droits et libertés et je représente une coalition, la C.S.N., la F.T.Q., la Centrale des Enseignants du Québec qui travaillent de concert avec les groupes pacifistes et les groupes environnementaux qui se questionnent sur les activités militaires sur les territoires du Labrador et du Québec, de leur terrible nuisance sur la vie des humains, des animaux, des plantes et sur le viol des droits.

Nous avons soumis un mémoire à La Romaine. Pour résumer, pour ceux qui n'étaient pas là, nous exigeons premièrement que l'examen systématique des impacts environnementaux soit sérieux et qu'il respecte les normes d'exhaustivité et d'objectivité dans leur évaluation.

Deuxièmement, nous avons demandé qu'un moratoire... qu'il y ait un moratoire sur les vols à basse altitude genre "top gun", qu'on voit dans les films ici au cinéma, pour corriger l'ignoble inconséquence - j'espère que la traduction va être correcte - de l'armée canadienne pour avoir commencé des exercices avant d'évaluer l'impact social et environnemental et aussi, il ne faut pas l'oublier, connaître ce que la population canadienne a à dire sur l'évolution de la militarisation au Canada.

Troisièmement, nous avons demandé de venir à Montréal, dans les grandes villes, pour pouvoir être entendus.

Vous êtes venus à quelques semaines d'avis. Je dois avouer que les groupes que je représente et moi, principalement, aussi la Ligue de son côté, les groupes environnementaux du leur, les groupes pacifistes étaient peut-être plus prêts parce qu'ils ont une plus longue expérience; on n'a pas eu le temps de finir nos travaux.

On vous a demandé de revenir. Les groupes de bénévoles, les spécialistes tout de même, comme les groupes environnementaux vous ont demandé de revenir en novembre. Qu'est-ce qu'un (1) mois pour un tel projet?

Plusieurs d'entre nous ont déjà mis beaucoup de temps, par les soirs, les fins de semaine, qui sont très précieuses et rares, monsieur le Président, pour se voir nier de pouvoir se faire entendre. On tient à ce que vous reveniez parce que les groupes environnementaux, la Ligue des droits et libertés, les syndicats ont des experts, mais la plupart travaillent en bénévoles et on veut avoir l'occasion de vous dire face à face, pas de côté comme ça là, mais face à face ce qu'on aimerait vous dire.

Monsieur Yergeau cet après-midi, dont vous avez pu apprécier les compétences, vous a éloquemment expliqué les raisons pour revenir. Il semble que votre refus soit définitif.

Nous, nous revenons sur cette demande. Le processus a déjà souffert d'un accroc, au moins; je comprendrais mal qu'un petit accroc à votre horaire ne soit possible. Cela indiquerait pour nous votre refus d'écouter des groupes qui au Québec sont reconnus comme ayant une grande expertise et une grande compétence en droit et en environnement.

Cela ne nous empêchera pas de vous dire ce qu'on pense, mais par d'autres avenues, pourrait-on dire.

Nous avons l'intention de nous consulter à propos de votre refus - nous espérons toujours qu'il n'est pas définitif - pour chercher les meilleurs moyens d'avertir la population canadienne et québécoise des dangers que représente le fait, au Canada, que des projets graves, d'envergure internationale, aux impacts presque immesurables, je ne sais pas si c'est un mot français, mais moi je le fais s'il ne l'est pas là, je ne sais pas comment vous allez pouvoir mesurer, on ne le sait pas encore, puis on aimerait avoir du temps pour y penser, que des projets semblables puissent s'engager dans des conditions comme celles qui ont prévalu depuis le début des vols en basse altitude au Labrador et au Québec.

Pour finir, j'aimerais vous dire qu'en fin novembre, nous serons prêts - ça prendrait peut-être le nouveau maire de Montréal pour vous inviter - je pense que vous ne pouvez pas refuser, puis de toute façon je pense que comme bonus ça vous permettrait aussi, c'est une pointe gentille que je vous lance là, de pratiquer un peu de français, ça ne ferait pas de tort. Merci beaucoup.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Our next schedule speaker is Mr. Christian Boulais, Coalition québécoise pour le désarmement et la paix.

PAR MONSIEUR BOULAIS: Bonjour. Je vous dis que je ne suis pas trop à l'aise d'être ici puis j'ai l'impression que ça ne donnera pas grand-chose non plus, mais enfin...

Okay, je m'appelle Christian Boulais, je suis biologiste de profession, mais je suis militant pacifiste aussi et puis je viens ici au nom de la Coalition québécoise sur le désarmement.

Le problème que je viens soulever ici, c'est un problème qui est relié indirectement aux vols militaires, mais c'est un problème que les vols militaires au Labrador impliquent aussi. C'est le fait que, bon, ces vols-là, ça constitue un entraînement militaire pour des forces. Cet entraînement-là correspond aux nécessités d'une doctrine militaire qui s'appelle le Plan Rogers. Puis nous autres, on considère que le PlanRogers est un facteur de déstabilisation quand il va être appliqué et puis de ce fait-là la conséquence indirecte de ces vols-là c'est qu'on contribue à l'élaboration d'une doctrine qui risque d'augmenter les risques de guerre nucléaire.

C'est ça l'objet principal. Le Plan Rogers vise à... L'entraînement qu'on est en train de donner aux aviateurs, c'est un entraînement, bon, qui va leur permettre de voler à basse altitude, à haute vitesse. C'est pour remplir les conditions pour mener des attaques qu'on appelle en anglais des "strikes", des attaques en profondeur, et puis tel que le Plan Rogers est présenté, c'est supposé compléter là la réponse flexible de l'OTAN, c'est-à-dire donner le plus de temps en cas d'attaque du Pacte de Varsovie aux forces conventionnelles de retenir cette attaque et d'élever le niveau d'utilisation des armes nucléaires.

Je ne sais pas si on me comprend bien là. Je suis mal à l'aise dans ces choses-là mais, enfin, je veux les soulever pareil.

Donc, le Plan Rogers est présenté comme un élément de plus dans les défenses conventionnelles de l'OTAN, sauf qu'il donne les capacités à l'OTAN de mener des attaques en profondeur aux dispositifs d'attaque soviétiques, les points stratégiques soviétiques, sauf que quand ce plan-là va être au point, quand les forces... la capacité va être acquise par l'OTAN, on parle de système d'armes à acheter qui vont coûter vingt (20) milliards sur dix (10) ans; bien, d'un point de vue soviétique, qu'est-ce qu'on va voir en face de nous autres, c'est un système qui va être capable de mener... de nous attaquer - je parle d'un point de vue soviétique là - et puis ça, ça risque, en temps de crise, ça risque d'amener les russes à être tentés de mener une attaque préventive contre les forces de l'OTAN, pour empêcher, justement, que l'OTAN se serve de cette capacité-là.

Ça fait que c'est ça, en tant que tel, nous autres, on voit que ces vols-là... on s'oppose à ces vols-là parce qu'ils sont faits dans le cadre d'une doctrine qu'on juge menaçante pour la paix mondiale.

Puis moi je trouve ça un peu effrayant que dans les médias on ne parle pas du tout de ces questions-là militaires. On nous présente ces vols-là, bon, anodinement, comme ça là. On nous parle de l'impact réel là qu'ils risquent d'avoir sur la vie des gens qui vivent là-bas sur leur territoire, sauf qu'on ne nous parle pas du tout du rôle de ces vols-là dans une stratégie militaire, dont on ne nous parle pas du tout, qu'on nous présente comme strictement défensive quand, en fait, il y a une grande implication ... qu'elle risque d'être offensive aussi.

C'est tout. C'est pas mal tout là. Si vous avez quelque chose à demander...

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would anyone on the Panel care to pose a question? Yes, Doctor Wilkinson.

DOCTOR WILKINSON:

PAR DOCTEUR WILKINSON: Je voulais juste dire que le but de notre article six point deux point deux (6.2.2), là où on demande au promoteur de soumettre une justification du projet, dans cette section, on s'attendait à ce qu'il nous fournisse certaines informations sur les aspects stratégiques de ces activités. Si, par exemple, ça fait partie du Plan Rogers ou de quelque chose d'autre.

Le problème pour nous autres, c'est que notre mandat est assez limité, on ne peut pas se prononcer sur la valeur de l'OTAN, sur les aspects stratégiques de la question, mais nous avons tout de même demandé, pour que nous, ainsi que le grand public, puissions bien comprendre tout le contexte national, international de ce projet, que le type d'information que vous avez demandé soit au moins fourni.

PAR MONSIEUR BOULAIS: Bon, okay. De toute façon, ils pourront toujours dire ça en filigrane, là, mais je sais très bien que ça ne donnera rien pareil. Les choses vont se faire quand même et puis...

Moi, je voudrais juste ajouter pour finir là que si en Europe, ils ont été capables d'installer des euro-missiles malgré les protestations de millions de personnes, moi, j'ai l'impression que tout ça, ici, ça ne donne rien. Ils vont les faire pareil leurs bebelles et puis...

Mais je veux dire... Enfin, je vais finir là-dessus. J'allais juste dire que... je pense qu'il y a des gens honnêtes sur la Commission là, ce n'est pas ça que je veux dire là, mais j'ai l'impression que c'est ça qui va arriver. Ça va se faire pareil malgré tout.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next scheduled speaker for this evening's session is Mr. Jean Philipe Waaub of Les Amis de la terre du Québec.

PAR MONSIEUR WAAUB: Bonsoir tout le monde. Bonsoir aux membres de la Commission. Puis je pense qu'il faut que je m'excuse si je parle juste en français.

Ensuite, je voudrais quand même commencer par quelques petites remarques préliminaires.

Tout d'abord, que les Ami-e-s de la Terre appuient la Coalition québécoise de l'Environnement pour demander des journées d'audience à la mi-novembre, étant donné que nous-mêmes, on considère qu'on a été un peu pressé dans la façon dont on a reçu nos documents et que même d'autres organismes n'ont même pas bénéficié des documents que nous autres on a reçuset de ce petit délai.

Alors, une autre chose aussi, pour commencer, c'est que, évidemment, c'est un petit peu déplorable d'avoir une audience qui est quasiment uniquement anglophone, en tous les cas, mais j'imagine qu'une grande partie de mon audience est en fait à ma droite et pas à ma gauche.

Pour commencer, disons, les Ami-e-s de la Terre du Québec déplorent la composition de la Commission, en ce sens que, évidemment sans enlever aucun mérite ou des compétences aux six (6) ou sept (7) membres qu'elle contient, elle ne tient aucun cas de la réelle représentativité des populations touchées par le présent projet. Il est donc proposé que la Commission soit dissoute et reconstruite immédiatement pour être composée au moins paritairement de personnes extérieures au projet et de personnes représentant les populations touchées.

Ensuite, alors qu'on s'attend à ce qu'un processus d'évaluation environnementale permette de prendre une décision sur le fait qu'un projet soit souhaitable ou non, on s'aperçoit ici que, en fait, la décision du projet est déjà prise, les vols ont commencé depuis plusieurs années, l'intensification des pratiques militaires est déjà planifiée et, en plus, la décision concernant le centre d'entraînement à l'emploi des armes des chasseurs tactiques pour les forces de l'OTAN sera prise indépendamment, alors là complètement indépendamment et bien avant la fin du processus d'évaluation environnementale dont il est question ici.

La fréquence des passages, excusez... L'étude environnementale vise ici uniquement à minimiser - donc, il n'y a aucune remise en question du projet - il y a espoir de minimisation de certains impacts par des moyens tels que changer un peu la hauteur de vol, la vitesse des avions, la fréquence des passages, la localisation des cibles d'entraînement, et caetera. En fait, des choses extrêmement techniques. Les avions passeront. Alors que la question est bien plus de savoir si de telles manoeuvres sont environnementalement acceptables, quand je dis environnementalement c'est au sens large, et souhaitées aussi par la population résidente.

L'utilité même du processus environnemental semble bien plus d'endormir, en fait, les consciences, de favoriser un bavardage et l'étalement d'expertises biologiques, anthropologiques et autres, que de poser les véritables questions et de les débattre surtout. C'est un magnifique exercice d'échapper aux véritables questions.

Bien sûr, bon la présence des avions a un impact sonore sur l'environnement, implique certains risques de pollution, bouleverse le mode de vie des autochtones; ça, de toute façon... dès aujourd'hui, d'ailleurs, les témoignages le prouvent en fait, personne ne nie ça aujourd'hui, l'évaluation environnementale, elle est beaucoup plus là pour quantifier un dégât qui est en fait déjà planifié et à le rendre acceptable par des négociations ponctuelles.

Parce qu'en fait, la première force du processus environnemental est de focaliser l'attention sur des éléments ponctuels, entraînant, si possible, des expertises et des contre-expertises des deux (2) parties, et d'éviter ainsi des débats fondamentaux relatifs à la mise en cause des projets et à la proposition d'alternatives valables. C'est un point important à souligner.

C'est l'ensemble de la société québécoise et des populations autochtones qui sont touchées par un tel projet. En effet, alors que l'idée d'une crise économique est soigneusement entretenue et que l'on nous parle de politique d'austérité, qu'on parle de coupures aussi, on observe une militarisation croissante importante du territoire québécois, qui se fait à coup de millions.

Plusieurs gros projets militaires ou d'armement le confirment. Qu'il s'agisse... il faut quand même replacer, en effet, ce projet-là dans le cadre d'autres projets militaires qui sont tous interreliés, eux: le champ de tir au Saguenay, l'usine Bell Hélicoptère, les F-18 et bien d'autres, dont maintenant l'accroissement des vols à basse altitude sur un territoire de plus de cent mille (100 000) kilomètres carrés, qui n'appartient même pas aux gens qui le briment, et même l'établissement et l'exploitation d'un centre d'entraînement à l'emploi des armes des chasseurs tactiques pour les forces de l'OTAN.

Tous ces projets, y compris ceux qui nous occupent aujourd'hui, impactent toute la société québécoise et les populations autochtones ainsi que leur environnement.

Des questions doivent être posées en terme de recherches d'alternatives réelles à ce genre de projets, utilisant en fait des ressources financières, humaines et environnementales de l'ensemble du territoire québécois et du Labrador et des autres territoires touchés.

Soulignons aussi l'impact certainement visé - là, c'est peut-être un petit procès d'intentions gentil - d'une présence militaire - évidemment dans la publicité du document des Forces armées, on parle qu'on est à cinq (5) heures de tous les pays de l'OTAN qui seraient intéressés à venir faire des pratiques, mais on est surtout, à mon point de vue, on est surtout à quinze (15) minutes du Parlement québécois et on sait quelle importance ça a déjà pu avoir. On a lieu, à ce propos, de s'étonner aussi et de s'inquiéter sérieusement de l'absence totale d'implication et du silence, en fait plus ou moins complice, que le gouvernement du Québec manifeste au sujet de ce projet, alors que des antécédents de co-évaluations ou d'évaluations séparées, pourrait-on dire, existent ou sont envisageables.

Un autre point, c'est que les autochtones sont littéralement dépossédés de leurs droits et de leur territoire. Non seulement ils subissent déjà de l'extérieur un système économique, un mode de production, des valeurs sociétales qui ne sont absolument pas les leurs mais, en plus, on les dépossède de littéralement de leur territoire au nom de l'intérêt commun. Entendons ici l'intérêt de l'ensemble des canadiens qui ont décidé de loin que c'était ça.

La page couverture, pour revenir à cette petite brochure que j'ai eu le plaisir de feuilleter, qui était extrêmement significative à mon avis quant aux intentions du promoteur; la page couverture, papier glacé, et caetera, qui publicisait Goose Bay à l'étranger comme centre d'entraînement est le reflet en fait, plus ou moins disons chromé, qui dévoile des propos mentionnant... alors là, je prendrai quelques citations: "Les régions"... ils mentionnent que "les régions de l'intérieur sont, à toutes fins utiles inhabitées" - bizarre - qu'avec "la participation des autochtones", et caetera, "on examine les effets possibles sur les troupeaux de caribous", très importants les troupeaux de caribous, évidemment. Focalisons encore la question sur un point très ponctuel, qui est évidemment relié à un certain nombre de choses mais quand même c'est une expertise qui va demander probablement des contre-expertises très intéressantes.

Et ensuite, on signale aussi dans cette brochure que Goose Bay au Labrador est un endroit idéal. Ça aussi, c'est une prise de position tout à fait normale, disons, avant le processus d'évaluation environnementale, dans la publicité.

Ce n'est pas tout, que "Goose Bay est un endroit idéal pour ce genre de projets" et que, en plus, pour les futurs militaires, ce sera, et je cite: "Un véritable paradis pour les amateurs de sports de plein air, de chasse et de pêche". C'est magnifique. C'est là l'attitude en fait réelle du promoteur du projet qui, soumis au processus d'évaluation environnementale, fait comme si on allait tenir compte, ici même, d'un environnement et d'une population très très importante.

On sait qu'on est en fait loin de l'autodétermination des peuples dont il a été question un petit peu plus tard et qui est, en fait, une des questions fondamentales dans ce débat.

Dans l'optique où le promoteur utiliserait telle quelle la fameuse ébauche de directives que nous avons reçue, les Ami-e-s de la Terre du Québec veulent enfin poser quelques dernières questions à ce sujet-là aussi.

La liste impressionnante, vraiment, j'étais... même si elle a déjà été complétée depuis, encore, de sujets à étudier et à prendre en compte est avant tout, selon nous, un véritable régal pour des experts du nord québécois mais, à notre avis, risque fort bien de ne servir à... pas à rien, mais à bien peu de choses, à part d'avoir une connaissance... à accumuler des connaissances sur le territoire et sur les gens.

De nombreux cas ont déjà montré la non-coopération des populations autochtones dans ces études. D'ailleurs, la plupart du temps c'était même le seul moyen qu'il leur restait pour s'opposer au projet, ce qui se comprend alors qu'ils ne coopèrent pas trop, alors qu'en fait ces populations-là ont la meilleure connaissance de leur environnement quotidien. Point n'est besoin d'envoyer des experts de l'extérieur.

Il est suggéré ici que la Commission donne une part du budget, devant servir à l'évaluation, aux parties touchées pour qu'elles réalisent elles-mêmes les parties qui les concernent dans l'étude d'impact.

Donc, on voit là une intervention qui est complémentaire à la composition de la Commission.

Le danger, en fait, d'un refus de coopération est réel, si une telle mesure n'était pas retenu. Et d'ailleurs, il est connu, puisqu'il a été prévu dans le document lui-même qui est l'ébauche, puisqu'on mentionne de façon un peu magnanime que si le promoteur ne dispose pas des données nécessaires et ne peut pas les obtenir par des moyens raisonnables - par moyens raisonnables, il faut comprendre, j'imagine, expertises extérieures imposées et aussi limites d'un certain budget dont, en fait, jusqu'à présent en tous les cas, je n'ai eu aucune information personnellement là-dessus, sur le budget qui permettra d'appréhender tous ces fameux impacts - et il doit aussi l'indiquer et décrire les efforts qu'il a faits pour obtenir ces données. Point final.

Alors, très bien, j'ai essayé d'obtenir des données, je n'ai pas réussi. Puis éventuellement aussi de dire un petit peu quelles sont les conséquences sur la valeur de l'étude puis le projet passe.

Ça, c'était la page vingt-neuf (29) de l'ébauche.

Ainsi, on a vu que les autochtones étaient exclus de l'étude, réduits à de véritables objets d'observation et auraient aussi - alors là, je pensais que c'était le clou du spectacle, ironie ou cynisme - le privilège de bénéficier, une fois tout écrit et tout décidé, de séances communautaires - je reprends les termes textuels là, il y a même un petit lexique qui nous avait été envoyé pour définir qu'est-ce que c'était qu'une séance communautaire - seules ouvertes à eux autres et véritables, en fait, lieux où tout le monde pourra s'adonner à la palabre, désormais rendue inutile, et à favoriser en fait la résignation et l'impuissance.

Le document intitulé "Le mandat pour l'examen des opérations aériennes militaires effectuées à partir de Goose Bay" mentionne que "toute la gamme des armes conventionnelles seraient employées dans les champs de tir, y compris des explosifs de grande puissance". C'est un petit peu vague.

Les Ami-e-s de la Terre du Québec aimeraient avoir des précisions à ce sujet et que ces questions soient traitées dans l'étude d'impact, de façon approfondie, et peut-être des questions du style la possibilité d'utilisation de lasers par exemple, ou bien d'armes nucléaires dites à portée limitée. Est-ce que ça va venir un jour aussi dans ce projet-là? Est-ce que c'est une dimension qui risque de s'ajouter à un moment donné? Est-ce qu'il faudra faire de nouvelles études d'impact éventuellement ce jour-là?

Parce que la technologie militaire, on le sait, n'arrête pas d'avancer. On construit un mur pour résister à un obus et puis l'obus pour démolir le mur et et caetera. C'est qu'on voit où mène l'escalade puis de nouvelles armes feront d'autres "bangs".

Enfin, une question se pose sur le pas en avant que représenterait un tel projet - j'entends le projet de base de l'OTAN et d'intensification de ces vols à basse altitude - dans l'escalade de l'implication canadienne à l'Initiative de Défense Stratégique, ou bien la guerre des étoiles ou IDS, et des dangers subséquents que cela représente pour l'ensemble du Québec et du Canada. Ça veut dire que ça doit être tenu en compte dans l'étude d'impact, surtout quand on sait que les U.S.A. ont absolument besoin des territoires nordiques canadiens pour installer leur système de défense et que, peut-être, on est déjà commis à notre insu dans ce processus-là.

Je vous remercie.

Excusez, j'avais oublié un petit mot pour terminer, c'est qu'avec les autochtones, nous demandons un moratoire complet... nous demandons un arrêt immédiat des vols à basse altitude sur le... pour le moment.

Je pensais que la fameuse réponse tout

à l'heure de la personne qui disait qu'on allait... en fait, c'est comme si on allait les enterrer afin de les empêcher de parler, plutôt... on dirait: Pourquoi les arrêter maintenant alors qu'on ne leur a même pas demandé leur avis encore. Mais moi je pense que si on continue à faire ces vols-là, c'est comme si, en fait, on les enterrait à la place de... quand ils auront la bouche pleine de terre et de bruit on ira leur demander vraiment qu'est-ce qu'ils ressentent.

Puis une petite dernière remarque, c'est qu'on pourrait imaginer, en fait, une espèce de grand casque d'insonorisation au-dessus du comité et puis ça représenterait très bien, à mon avis, ce que représente l'ébauche de directives du projet d'évaluation environnementale; un casque anti-sonore pour la Commission.

Merci et là j'ai vraiment terminé.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would anyone care to ask the gentleman a question?

You asked far too many questions for us to be able to deal with them all here tonight, in fairness to the other speakers that we have left, but I would like to say two things in response to what you said.

One is, that the guidelines document does not in any way exclude the very desirable idea of using the native people themselves as a source of very valuable information for this review. I cannot see how you can conclude that we have excluded that possibility.

MR. WAAUB: Habituellement, l'absence de mention signifie très clairement les intentions du document, à mon avis. Et que si vraiment il y avait quelque chose qui avait été prévu, on pourrait l'écrire dedans.

THE CHAIRMAN: The guidelines do not tell the Department of National Defence where to go to look for its sources of information. I do not believe we have indicated that anywhere, so by not naming any, I do not see how we have excluded them.

MR. WAAUB: Excusez-moi,

mais le bruit m'a empêché de comprendre votre question. Est-ce que vous pouvez répéter?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was not a question. It was a statement, that the Panel in its guidelines document has not directed the Department of National Defence towards any specific sources of information, and certainly, we have not attempted to limit them. They may go anywhere they wish to seek information and views in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

In doing so, we would certainly expect and strongly encourage them to tap the very important source of the native people themselves. We would expect that to be done.

MR. WAAUB: Merci, c'est parfait.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a very simple answer to one of your other questions. There is no where in this proposal that is under review any plan to use nuclear weapons. So, the answer to that question is, nuclear weaponry is not a part of this review and if, in future, it were to be considered it would require a review.

PAR MONSIEUR WAAUB: Mon inquiétude justement mentionnait qu'en général on s'engage dans un processus. En effet, on fait une étude d'impact aujourd'hui. Encore une fois là, on ponctualise les études d'impact sur des sujets bien précis et bien limités comme vous l'avez dit - et je ne vous en blâmerai pas puisque c'est votre mandat et vous l'avez reçu - mais ce que je reprochais ici, c'est justement de ponctualiser sur certaines armes dites qu'on va utiliser actuellement, mais rien ne nous garantit qu'un autre jour on ne décidera pas autre chose pour d'autres armes, d'autres essais et qu'à ce moment-là il faudra encore refaire une autre étude d'impact sur ce point précis et puis recommencer tout.

Je trouvais que c'était un peu du gaspillage d'argent surtout quand on sait que, justement, les innovations technologiques et les besoins d'essayer toutes ces nouvelles armes se font... sont très pressants au niveau de l'armée, qui désire expérimenter, même aux frais des gens.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if we all keep in mind that the purpose of the proposed training centre is to train pilots in various tactical operations and that that can be done apparently quite adequately with dummy weapons, and, perhaps, conventional weaponry, then there is no reason to anticipate that that training centre is going to be used for nuclear weapons.

I, for one, am quite glad to see that such is not part of this proposal.

Would you care to say anything else before you finish?

MR. WAAUB: Non, c'est peut-être just l'histoire que, en fait, c'est toujours cet aspect-là justement de revenir sur des points particuliers. Je ne mentionnais pas une intention quelconque là, c'est juste de vois à quel point on ponctualise les ... et puis qu'on ce lance dans des expertises et contre-expertises, qu'on débat beaucoup et qu'en fait tout ça évite de poser les vraies questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Now, I have been informed that the next group that was scheduled to speak, that is the Alliance pour l'action non-violente, has withdrawn from the list of speakers. Is that correct? Is there anybody here from that group? If not, then we will proceed to the last scheduled speaker of the evening and that is Mr. Erik Poole, Groupe de recherche sur la paix, Université Laval.

PAR MONSIEUR POOLE: Bonsoir monsieur Barnes, membres de la Commission, mesdames et messieurs de l'audience.

D'abord je vais me présenter, je m'appelle Erik Poole, je suis un étudiant à la maîtrise en économie à l'Université Laval et je participe... je travaille au sein d'un groupe de recherche sur la paix également à l'Université Laval depuis quelques années.

Le mémoire que je dépose devant la Commission ce soir, il s'agit des propositions pour une analyse économique. Le mémoire a été préparé par moi-même, Suzanne Lévesque qui enseigne l'économie à l'Université McGill et Pierre Fortin, un économiste renommé ici au Québec, qui est un professeur par excellence au département de l'économie à l'Université Laval.

J'ai pris connaissance du fait cet après-midi que la plupart des membres de la Commission sont des anglophones unilingues et, vu la nature un petit peu technique du mémoire, je vais essayer de faciliter la tâche de compréhension d'une part des membres de la Commission et des traducteurs et traductrices en faisant un petit résumé, si vous me permettez d'abord en anglais avant de procéder avec la soumission en français et j'espère sauver du temps en ne lisant pas le mémoire au complet. Ça ne me surprendrait pas que vous soyez tannés après une longue journée.

Poole, sub.

Rapidly, in English, what we are proposing is an economic analysis, non-anthropological analysis or not necessarily even an ecological analysis in the large sense of the term but an economical analysis, that may help to guide and orientate the Commission in terms of making recommendations to the Minister of Defence as to how to proceed with their study and how to resolve the difficulties.

The existence of this process, of the federal process, implies the existence of what we call in economics "social and economical external costs", which are associated with the low-level flights.

We could also postulate that the interest expressed by the residents of Labrador and Newfoundland for the eventual tactical training centre of NATO is largely derived from the expectation of economic benefits anticipated for the area, and that their interest for the Project has really very little to do with a deep comprehension, understanding, of the role of these military activities in the defence of the member Nations of NATO. That is, in a sense, just as an introduction to say why an economic analysis is so important.

Effectively, we propose a cost benefit analysis and in terms of identifying and measuring the benefits, we remind the Panel that the military sector -- this is a totalogy, excuse me --

Poole, sub.

but this is a public sector -- a military base is capital-intensive and normally weak in terms of creating jobs and that the multiplier effect in terms of employment created is usually less than that of other economic activities. I think this has been imperically proven on a number of different occasions.

This kind of development also encourages a dependence on the state and constitutes the anti-thithesist of autonomous economical development. In the short run the unemployment rate may drop, but in the long run if and when the base is closed or the tactical training centre is closed, that the structural unemployment problem will be as high as ever.

Externalities are the benefits and costs that come from economic activity that are not absorbed directly by the producer, but that are broadcast elsewhere. And, in this case, we are talking about negative externalities: Pollution. There are several ways of identifying -- some of the externalities are easy to identify.

Resolving the externalities from the economical -- from this particular analysis point of view is relatively easy in certain cases. All we have to do is just compensate people. Measuring the economic activity in all cases is not necessarily that easy. I am sure you have had

Poole, sub.

this already pointed out to you. There is the exploitation of phonic resources by native groups, and that should be probably done, as I think was already done in the case of the Baie James Treaty.

In terms of externalities as to the suggested genocide of the Montagnais' culture, well, that is a little difficult and as we raised in our memoire, that raises some methodological problems that you might also eventually run across.

I would suggest that American Indian cultures is a declining resource, and ideally, as they decline in number they become rare and they should become more valuable. Obviously, if you placed a supreme and absolute value on the native cultures of this land our society never would have allowed their land to be invaded and confiscated in the first place. Again, obviously, we cannot rewrite history but we do not have to repeat it either.

Compensation of external costs, as I suggested, that is easy in some cases. As to who compensates external cost, the people who benefit and the deciders - the people who opted for this option, should be the ones to compensate the losers.

In this case, in terms of economic benefits, it seems quite evident that Québec does not stand a lot to gain and if the federal government

Poole, sub.

as well as the provincial government of Newfoundland, has both the responsibility for the decision-making process and as beneficiaries for the military activities, should compensate the federal government of Québec for any costs that may be related to any increase in demand for social services or the loss of certain economic activities.

One way of resolving the problem would be to have the costs fall upon those who decided, and we would suggest that the people in the north were not the ones who opted for the Rogers Plan or Follow-on Forward attack, and this is ridiculous; this is a hypothesis, but you could relocate the low-level flights to the larger cities of the south: Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec. That is obviously not possible and it would create more problems than it would solve. A reasonable compromise might be to stop the low-level flights, because they tend to broadcast their externalities over a large area and to, perhaps, allow the tactical training centre to be installed, because those activities could be confined to a relatively small area.

Whatever the decision, people would have to negotiate with the potential losers in this particular case, and, perhaps, as an ultimate solution surrounding this particular project and other development projects in the future,

Poole, sub.

the federal government is just going to have to climb down and negotiate a land claims treaty with the native people in both Québec and Labrador. I hope that was not too long.

PAR MONSIEUR POOLE: L'existence même de ce processus d'évaluation environnementale implique la présence de coûts externes sociaux et économiques associés aux vols à basse altitude.

On peut postuler que l'intérêt des résidents du Labrador et de Terre-Neuve pour un éventuel centre d'entraînement tactique de l'OTAN provient surtout des retombées économiques anticipées pour la région, et a très peu à voir avec une compréhension approfondie du rôle de ces activités militaires dans la défense des pays de l'OTAN.

Alors ce qu'on fait là, c'est qu'on suggère que le ministère entame une analyse des avantages coûts et surtout dans le volet coûts identifie et cherche à compenser les externalités, les coûts externes sociaux et économiques.

Alors, au niveau des avantages, il y a évidemment des avantages pour Goose Bay. Les activités militaires actuelles à Goose Bay rapportent environ cent (100) millions de dollars, selon les estimations que j'ai eues du Colonel John David, à l'économie locale, dont cinquante pour cent (50%) sont attribuables aux vols à basse altitude. Et puis il va y avoir quoi, quatre-vingt-treize (93) millions investis à court terme.

L'éventuel centre de l'OTAN pourrait

coûter entre deux cents (200) et huit cents (800) millions et aurait un coût annuel d'opération de cent (100) à trois cents (300) millions.

Alors, le Colonel John David, le commandant responsable à la base de Goose Bay, m'avait suggéré que l'effet multiplicateur était de l'ordre de trois (3) à cinq (5) et c'est évident que si le multiplicateur est de cet ordre-là, les retombées économiques seront importantes et appréciées dans cette région.

Mais on vous signale tout de suite là que le multiplicateur de l'activité économique agrégée pour l'ensemble du Canada est d'environ un virgule trois (1,3) et ça, au bout de un an et demi (1 1/2), deux (2) ans.

Alors surtout si... ça, c'est juste entre parenthèses là, si les employés du ministère de la Défense sont en position de fournir des renseignements aux journalistes. C'est un dossier très complexe. Moi-même, j'ai écrit là-dessus, j'ai fait des erreurs là. Je pense que ça serait une bonne idée de ne pas exagérer trop trop les bénéfices et les retombées attendus.

Ce type d'activités économiques... bon, d'abord, l'effet multiplicateur, énormément, comme j'ai dit tantôt en anglais, en terme d'emplois est moindre que celui d'autres activités économiques.

Selon une étude qui a été faite par Michel Truchon, à l'Université Laval, pour la province de Terre-Neuve, c'est de un virgule quatre (1,4). D'après moi, c'est très généreux ce multiplicateur-là. Ça, évidemment, ce n'est pas la place pour entrer dans une querelle de chiffres là, ça c'est quelque chose que le ministère devrait regarder de près.

Ce type d'activités encourage la dépendance à l'égard de l'état et constitue donc l'antithèse du développement économique autonome.

Le projet de centre d'entraînement tactique soulagerait pendant sa durée le chômage conjoncturel mais très peu le chômage structurel.

Ce dernier est le résultat d'une situation où les emplois offerts ne concordent pas avec les qualifications des gens ou encore provient d'un faible attachement de certaines personnes au travail rémunéré.

Vous voyez tout de suite l'avantage de notre approche là. Même si c'est économique et c'est très borné et serré là, ça permet la possibilités d'autres valeurs que strictement une société de production et de consommation.

Externalités. Les externalités sont les avantages et les coûts engendrés par une activité économique qui ne sont pas absorbés directement par le producteur, mais diffusés ailleurs et supportés par la collectivité ou des individus, sans que ces derniers ne soient directement impliqués dans le processus de production.

Or, ici, on a affaire à une externalité négative, un type de pollution, c'est la pollution sonore,selon les extrapolations faites par Raynald Marcoux du CAM, qui atteint parfois jusqu'à cent quarante (140) décibels, sûrement ça c'est un autre aspect des conséquences qui serait exploré par le ministère.

S'il s'agit de fermer des pourvoiries ou je ne sais pas, le projet de la vente...
la commercialisation de la vente des caribous à Kujjuaq, l'ancien Fort Chimo, bon ça c'est relativement simple, on n'a qu'à compenser jusqu'au moment où on atteint le même niveau d'utilité qu'auparavant.

En ce qui concerne la mesure de l'importance des activités économiques potentiellement affectées par les vols à basse altitude, il ne faut pas négliger l'importance de l'exploitation faunique. Il y a des études qui sont justement faites ... on a justement tenté de mesurer cette activité-là. Peut-être que ce serait possible aussi de traduire l'importance de cette activité en dollars et sous.

Évidemment, si, comme plusieurs anthropologues et, bon les Montagnais eux-mêmes le main-tiennent, la survie de la culture montagnaise est mise en danger parce que les Montagnais n'iront plus dans la forêt en unités familiales. Bon, dans un premier temps, on peut s'attendre à ce que la demande en services sociaux augmente. Ça, c'est facile, on peut financer ça. On peut consacrer davantage de ressources dans les secteurs affectés. Mais dans la pire hypothèse, comment peut-on compenser la perte d'une culture? Comment peut-on mesurer la valeur monétaire de la culture montagnaise? Les problèmes méthodologiques sont considérables.

Si notre société reconnaissait une valeur suprême et absolue à la culture d'une nation autochtone, elle n'aurait jamais permis que les terres de ces gens soient envahies et confisquées. Il n'est pas en notre pouvoir de réécrire l'histoire, mais rien ne nous oblige à la répéter non plus.

Alors, au fur et à mesure de l'analyse avantages et coûts, si suite aux estimations il s'avère que les avantages soient supérieurs aux coûts, peut-être faudra-t-il continuer les vols à basse altitude et aller de l'avant avec le Centre d'entraînement tactique, mais les bénéficiaires et décideurs devraient compenser les perdants. Et dans le cas du Québec, le Québec ne bénéficie pas ou presque pas du tout, sauf, je ne sais pas, je pense qu'il y a quelqu'un à Chicoutimi qui vend du lait à Goose Bay, mais en tous les cas... Par conséquent, le gouvernement fédéral, ainsi que le gouvernement provincial de

Terre-Neuve, en tant que responsables et bénéficiaires des activités militaires devraient compenser le gouvernement du Québec.

J'avais déjà soulevé la possibilité de résoudre ces problèmes par le déplacement des vols vers les grands centres urbains du sud où habitent les gens, les décideurs qui ont opté pour cette option de défense, Plan Rogers - Follow-on Forward Attack Deep Strike - tous les sous-concepts de réponse flexible - flexible response. Évidemment, les vols au-dessus des banlieues d'Ottawa, Montréal, Québec créeraient beaucoup plus de problèmes qu'ils n'en résoudraient.

Un compromis raisonnable serait de cesser les vols à basse altitude qui diffusent leurs externalités à travers un vaste territoire de cent mille (100 000) kilomètres carrés et de permettre l'installation du Centre d'entraînement tactique.

Ce Centre d'entraînement tactique promet d'être le plus intéressant au plan des retombées économiques et ainsi limiterait la diffusion de ses externalités à une zone étroite et unique à l'intérieur du Labrador et près de la base où habitent les gens qui en bénéficieraient directement.

Quelle que soit la décision prise, il faudra négocier avec les perdants dansle but d'arriver à définir une compensation adéquate pour les externalités. Et dans le cas des autochtones, nous suggérons une convention relative aux droits territoriaux incluant les compensations nécessaires et comportant des clauses décrivant le type et la fréquence des activités militaires permises, tout cela pourrait résoudre les problèmes mentionnés ci-haut.

Merci. J'ai terminé.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Poole. That is, as you say, a rather complex paper, and I wonder if anyone on the Panel would wish to seek any clarification on any point. Are there some questions from the audience? Apparently not. Well, again, thank you very much.

MR. POOLE: Merci beaucoup, bonsoir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes our list of scheduled speakers, I believe. We are quite prepared to take the remainder of our scheduled time this evening for any spontaneous presentations from the audience. Would anyone care to come forward and say anything?

If not then, I presume that the time has come to close the meeting. Before I do just a few words: A lot has been said here today about the refusal of the Panel to either postpone this meeting or to hold another meeting here in Montréal.

I think everyone should understand that participation in this review is open to any interested party; that the existence of this review was made known by the Minister in March of this year, which was seven months ago. There have been several announcements since that time, such as the appointment of the Panel, including who the members are and what their background is; an announcement of the terms of reference of the Panel; an announcement of the procedures that the

Panel is using in this review.

I believe there has been ample opportunity for any interested party to have seen one or more of these announcements, or to have seen one of the many articles that have been published by the news media on this so they could have been aware that all this is going on. It is a very simple matter for any interested party to contact the FEARO office and to be placed on the mailing list. Anyone who is on that mailing list receives a copy of every public announcement, and, indeed, every item of information, every brief, that is presented to the Panel becomes a public document available on request to anyone who wishes to have a copy.

This meeting in Montréal was not included, I admit, in the original list of proposed meeting locations by the Panel, because the Panel felt obliged in the first instance to direct its attention to the geographical area of where one might expect the greatest environmental impacts to occur. However, at the request of one of the speakers here today, who, at that time described himself as acting on behalf of, I believe, five organizations, we decided to change our plans and to add a meeting here in Montréal and at the same time in all fairness to the Province of Newfoundland to add a meeting in St. John's.

The announcement of this meeting was

made at least 21 days in advance of the meeting. I do not know the exact date right offhand, but, certainly, met the procedures that were set out at the beginning, and, as promised in those procedures also, we have allowed much more than 30 days for the review of the Draft Guidelines document. The guidelines have been easy to obtain by anybody who is interested, as I said before, by contacting our office.

We planned two sessions here, which we felt was sufficient for the number of groups, on behalf of which the request for the meeting was made. Only very late last week were we inundated with a large number of registrations of speakers. I think we have attempted, as far as possible, to accommodate the needs of those people and to fairly allocate the time that we had available in this meeting.

In view of all that, and in view of the fact that the Panel was appointed in July and it feels obliged to get on with its work, that to think of holding another meeting late November, early December, would really unduly delay the process of the review and would be unfair to several of the parties involved.

So, having said all that, I would repeat our statement, that we must regretfully decline the request to hold a further meeting in this series in Montréal or to postpone the date of this meeting. This meeting is as it is and it has been held.

Nevertheless, as I said before, we would be very interested in receiving any written comments on the guidelines, as long as they are received by the end of October, and we promise to give every consideration to all of the presentations that we have received and will have received by that time when the Panel sits down in November to draw up a final form of the guidelines. Also, at that time, as I said before, we will consider some of the suggestions and requests that have been put forward with regard, for example, to the mandate of the Panel.

In closing then, I would like to thank everyone for coming. In particular, I would like to thank the speakers who have come forward. I would like to thank the hard-working Secretariat of the Panel. I believe by now all of you probably have come to know our Executive Secretary. If not, he is seated at the front of the room on your left. He is Mr. Carol Martin, and he or either the other two members of our Secretariat, would be very pleased to take any requests for further information, requests for enrollment on the mailing list, or just about any way that we could help you in your participation in the review. Thank you, also, to our Court Reporters, over on my left at the table at the side; to our Sound Technician, and to our very hard-working interpreters for today. Thank you all again very much and good evening.

---Whereupon the hearing concluded at 9:50 P.M., to be resumed in St. John's, Newfoundland on October 27, 1986.

Volume

13

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	ST. JOHN'S	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 27, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	13	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	ST. JOHN'S	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 27, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	13	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Holiday Inn, St. John's

DATE: October 27, 1986.

VOLUME: 13

INDEX

PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman 1397
Presentation by Major David McCabe 1404

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

John Kennedy 1415
Joanne Cag 1417
Peter Armitage 1418
Harold Hiscock and Joanne Cag 1424
Peter Armitage 1439
John Kennedy 1457
Harold Hiscock 1467
David Benson 1469
Walter Davis 1476
Ploughshares Youth 1481
Walter Davis 1487
Ian Strachan 1489
John Hickey 1498
Susan Shiner 1500
Dennis MacKay 1501
Tony Williamson 1507
Rita Anderson 1516
David Thompson 1520
Geoff Carre 1527
Alison Dyer 1530
John Ross 1535
Ian Strachan 1543
Herb Brett 1545
Jacob Rice 1552
John Hickey 1561
Media 1568
Geoff Carre 1568
Cyril Goodyear 1570
John Hickey 1573
David Thompson 1576

* * * * *

1A-1
ET:ET

---Upon commencing at 2:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this environmental assessment panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review into certain existing and proposed military flying activities out of Goose Bay, Labrador, and covering certain parts of Labrador and the Province of Quebec.

Thank you all for coming out this afternoon. As you are probably aware we have two sessions scheduled here in St. John's; this one and an evening session starting at 7:00 o'clock tonight.

Before introducing the panel I would like to present a few ground rules that we are going to have to use because we have an extensive list of registered speakers. At last count they numbered approximately 16. We did indicate in the announcement that we published concerning these meetings that, depending on the number of speakers, it might be necessary to restrict the length of any one presentation. While we never really like to place restrictions on speakers, unfortunately you will understand that it will be necessary for us to do so here in St. John's.

Given the time that we have then, we will be limiting each intervenor to a maximum of

1A-2

20 minutes, and we will have to be fairly rigid about that I am afraid. A few minutes before the speaker's time is up, I will attempt to discreetly advise him of that fact without making it too obvious, and I would really appreciate your cooperation in finishing up within or on your time limit. Thank you very much.

I will first introduce the members of the Panel. Following that I will give a brief outline of this review process in which we are involved, and after that we will hear a presentation on the project itself which will last for approximately 20 minutes, and following which we will entertain some questions on the nature of the project.

First of all, I will introduce the other members of the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table, to your left, there is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces, was for a time posted at Goose Bay; his last position with the Forces was Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions. Since his retirement, Mr. Stewart has lived in the Ottawa area where he presently operates a small farm. As you might imagine, he is bringing to this Panel his expertise in the nature and the operations of military aircraft.

Next is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has extensive experience in Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly with caribou and other wildlife. He was, for a time, employed with the Wildlife Division of the Newfoundland and Labrador government. He lives in St. John's where he is the Vice-President of Northland Associates Limited, a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resources issues.

Next to him is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik, Labrador, where he operates a small business. He is knowledgeable about the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador, and it is mainly with regard to that that he has been appointed to this Panel.

On my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec, where he has been quite active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs, and active also in the commercial life of that town. Prior to his retirement, Mr. Jourdain was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for possibly 20 years.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant established in Montreal where he lives. He has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

I am presently employed with the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa where, when I am not acting in my capacity as Chairman of this Panel, I am Director for the Atlantic Region for that office. I have Leen there for approximately one year, prior to which I was employed in the Environment Department of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, here in St. John's.

The Panel depends quite heavily on its Secretariat, which consists of three persons who do a variety of tasks to provide us with the information we need, to arrange for meetings such as this, to make arrangement so we can get to these meetings and back home again afterwards, and many other things. I would like to introduce them to you now so that you can get to know them. If you wish to arrange, for example, to be placed on the mailing list for this review, then see one of them and they will be glad to do that. They can also arrange to have publications sent to you if you wish to learn more about the background of the process under which we operate, or about this review in particular.

First of all, the Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin. He is assisted by Mr. Michel Bourgon, at the back of the room, and also by Mr. Jim Clarke, at the back of the room as well.

Now to briefly outline the review for you: This review was initiated in February of 1986 when the Associate Minister of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment describing certain on-going military flying activities, and certain proposed ones, and requested that the Minister of the Environment appoint a panel to carry out a public environmental review under the process established by the federal government for that purpose. That process is known as the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, and has been in place for approximately 13 years now.

The Minister did indeed appoint this Panel in July, and gave to it a certain mandate which is laid out in a document called our Terms of Reference, which has been made public and copies of which are available on request.

The first task of the Panel was to determine the issues that must be examined in this review and to prepare a document giving instructions to the Department of National Defence for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement which, as most of you know, will be the central document in this review. Those instructions will be contained in a document called the Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

In August of this year, the Panel published a draft of those guidelines, and these have been distributed to everyone on the mailing list and to a lot of other people on request.

The purpose of this present series of meetings which the Panel is conducting in 17 locations, is to solicit and obtain comment from any interested party on the contents of that Draft Guidelines document.

1A-6

The document, as it stands, represents the efforts of the Panel up to August to identify the issues and to determine the sorts of information that should be requested from National Defence when they prepare their Impact Statement.

I am pleased to note that already, in the meetings we have held, we have obtained a great many useful comments, suggestions for improving the Guidelines, and I would expect that we will receive more here today.

After these meetings are over at the end of October, the Panel will carefully examine the transcripts of all the meetings, the contents of all of the briefs that we are receiving in the course of these meetings, and will meet for several days in November to prepare the final form of the Guidelines.

Our intention, if all goes well, is to deliver the final Guidelines to the Department of National Defence some time early in December of this year. You will appreciate that once we have prepared the final form in English, because that is the working language of most of us on the Panel, that document will have to be translated into French and into certain Native languages as well. So we are really on a tight schedule, and we are, let us say, enjoying a very busy schedule during the month of October.

The month of December should see the beginning of the work by National Defence to research and prepare its Impact Statement.

At the present time we foresee the Impact Statement being delivered to the Panal perhaps in the early summer of 1987. That will begin a period of several months of review during which the Impact Statement will, of course, be available to the public for examination at the same time as the Panel will be examining it. When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, in that it has met the requirements of the Guidelines, the Panel will announce a round of public hearings to be held to discuss the Impact Statement and the project. One might imagine that those hearings would be held in the fall of 1987; certainly not any earlier than that.

Once the hearings are over, the Panel will then sit down to prepare its own report which it expects might be ready to be submitted to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence some time late in 1987, or early 1988.

That, then, is a brief outline of the process. I do not believe there is any need to go into any detail of the content of the Guidelines document. Just, very briefly, after some definitions and introduction, the document discusses the proposed scope of the review, some considerations with regard to methodology, a list of the nine issues which the Panel had identified up to August, and, finally, it lays out what might be regarded as a Table of Contents for the Environmental Impact Statement. We have extra copies of this Draft Guidelines document. If anyone would care to have one, please see one of the members of the Secretariat.

Before we go on, are there any questions at this point about the review? I would be glad to try to answer them. If not, then, it is time to hear something about the proposal that is under review.

It has become customary at all public meetings of this sort, held by a panel, to invite along a representative from the Proponent to briefly outline the project and to respond to some questions on that. Keeping in mind our time limitations, we will probably have to limit the question period to 10 minutes after the presentation.

I would now like you all to meet Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence. If you are ready, Major, please proceed with the presentation.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of St. John's.

Very quickly, and just for information, I am the Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre in National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa. I have spent some time in Goose Bay, initially as an Air Traffic Controller, and I have since flown through many times as a pilot.

I also work, in my current job, with

military plans, or development plans in general, for Goose Bay.

Goose Bay airport was constructed in 1941 as a staging base for aircraft transiting to Europe in support of the war effort. Since that time the airfield has seen a constant military presence, albeit at varying levals of activity. During the peak years of the mid sixties, nearly 12,000 military personnel and their families lives in Goose Bay.

The United States Air Force maintained, at the time, a force of interceptor aircraft for air defence purposes, and a large fleet of air refueler aircraft to support the Strategic Air Command bombers.

The Royal Air Force flew Vulcan bombers on low level navigation training flights from the late fifties under 1984, at which time the new Tornado aircraft replaced the aging Vulcan. The Royal Air Force has also used, over the time that they have been there, Phantoms, Harriers, Buccaneers and Jaguar aircraft.

Since 1980, there has been a noticeable in military flying, specifically low level flying. With the initial interest shown at that time by the German Air Force in commencing flying operations in Goose Bay, the Department of National Defence conducted an initial environmental evaluation to examine possible detrimental effect of increased low flying activity. It also included consideration for the requirement for a practice target range. This evaluation was

Forces operate the long range radar and air traffic control radar facilities, provide transient servicing to itinerant aircraft, and, as of March of this year, operate three rescue helicopters on a permanent basis.

In 1988, the Canadian Forces will established a deployed operating base at Goose Bay consisting of four CF-18 aircraft which will be there in a sovereignty and air defence role.

The Royal Air Force conducts low flying training, this year using nine Tornado aircraft.

The German Air Force conducts similar training, using F-4 Phantoms, Alph Jets, and also Tornados.

As well as practicing low level navigation and tactical manoeuvering, these aircraft occasionally use the practice target range located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. This range is in an open sandy area, which was previously burned out in a forest fire. It is approximately 13 kilometres in diameter, and is clearly marked with signs printed in four languages.

Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range. Some of these devices do have a smoke charge in them, a cold smoke charge as it is called, which helps to indicate the impact point on the ground. There are no plans at this time to use this range for live weapons.

Another site is being examined in the northern training area to establish a second practice range, but to date no formal approval has been received.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, the current users have indicated a desire to expand their operations somewhat over the next few years. As well, Canada is currently negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing a long-term training program at Goose Bay.

The Royal Netherlands Air Force hopes to conduct a half season training program in 1987 using 10 to 12 F-16 fighters, and about 120 personnel. The expanded program will continue to be oriented towards low level flying, with some night and poor weather flying being done as required. These last two activities are for training aircrew in the use of terrain following radar, currently installed in the Tornado aircraft.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay, is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which is a fancy name for a training school, if you like, for aircrew. This project, although merely a proposal at this time, has caught public attention because of its potential size and scope of activity. Before I provide some details of this proposal, let me give a brief background to the NATO Training Centre project.

Much of the tactical flying training of the NATO air forces is conducted over the densely populated countries of Western Europe, with a concentration over West Germany. Each year about 538,000 sorties are flown over Germany, day and night, a country with 63 million people. About 110,000 of these are in the low level regime. Existing training areas are extremely limited in size and capacity. Indeed, some types of training are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to lack of suitable facilities.

Recognizing a need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well-trainined air force, NATO studied the feasibility of establishing an integrated Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre which could provide a full spectrum of training for NATO aircrews. Nations were asked, at that time, to submit their training requirements, and based on these statistics a NATO appointed working group defined the scope of an optimum ideal facility to cater to all these training requirements.

As the working group was instructed at the time that cost was not to be a constraint during the scoping phase, a huge full scope centre was proposed. The scope of the training centre was detailed in the Phase I Report, as it is called, submitted to NATO in June of 1983.

Two countries have offered potential sites for the centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay, and Turkey has offered Konya Air Base.

Site surveys were conducted of each site last year, and an initial recommendation has been submitted to NATO by the working group. NATO had expected to decide on the selection of the most suitable site by December of this year.

Following that selection, negotiations and detailed planning and design will commence with the host country, taking into account updated national training requirements and environmental and operational restrictions which might directly influence the operation of the centre. This planning phase is due to be completed by December 1988. During this phase, if an insurmountable obstacle is encountered, then the alternate site would be considered.

The Training Centre is expected to commence operations in the early 1990's, barring any major delays.

The NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre project, in its optimum full scale, would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft conducting up to 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year. Or, in other words, for about 40 weeks of the year. Each two-week detachment would require up to 45 sorties every two weeks by transport aircraft to support the changeover of personnel and equipment. Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 aircrew and 1,300 ground personnel transiting through every two weeks. These personnel would be supported by a multi-national base staff of about 1,700. As these support personnel would be on a two or three year posting in the area, many of them could be expected to bring their families, thus further swelling the population by 1,000 or 1,500 people.

Facilities such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and consumer products stores would be required. Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of existing airfield facilities, such as a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the fuel storage and delivery system. A regular resupply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season, or expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system which is currently under construction.

As far as types of training activities which could be carried out, I must emphasize that to date there exists only a hypothetical model for this centre. As the initial training requirements were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase over the next two years. Suffice it say that as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several training activites depending on their dedicated roles. These might be: Low level tactical navigation and reconnaissance; air combat training at medium to high altitudes, including supersonic flight; electronic warfare training, using on-board and ground-based electronic equipment; practice weapons delivery, and here they are looking for an optimum of four ranges similar to the type that exists today; live weapons delivery, with an optimum of three ranges; tactical air support of maritime operations, which a fancy word for anti-shipping; and, last but not least, flag-type exercises, as we call them, involving multiple aircraft in a variety of roles all flying at the same time in support of each other.

Several of these requirements that I have mentioned are desirable only, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out. This includes a sea range which is involved with the anti-shipping that I mentioned earlier. A sea range is merely a location or an area of defined dimensions where aircraft can carry out tactical manoeuvering against military shipping, naval shipping. From time to time that might also include firing of weapons by the aircraft at a target towed by the ship.

Several such ranges already exist off the cost of Canada and the United States.

Another example would be an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must be sterile, or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it was established at all.

Since the initial statement of requirement for live weapons ranges that I mentioned earlier, technology has advanced to the stage that there exists today a capability to conduct weapons training missions during which accurate scoring is available against realistic targets on the ground without any weapons coming off the aircraft. This no-drop bomb scoring system, as it is called, has many obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment and significant cost savings due to ordinance expenditure reductions. Such a system would likely be part of the NATO Training Centre complex. Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored, and are cleaned up on a regular basis.

Socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project are directly proportional to the scope of the project. The Department of National Defence is currently completing a socio-economic study based on the expanded current operation and the NATO project. With reference to the latter, only a full scope optimum facility was examined in this study, as was defined in the Phase I Report that I mentioned earlier. The resulting data, therefore, are highly speculative as any downsizing of the scope of the facility would obviously result in proportionately lower socio-economic benefits.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: The initial construction phase and the regular on-going operational phase. During its site survey last year, the NATO working group examined the towns of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville as possible alternate airfield locations. These alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergencies or for weather diversion, or they could also be used to launch a small number of aircraft which would act in an adversary role for the training operation. Such utilization would require upgrading such as runway extension, refuelling systems and possibly some accommodations.

The NATO working group is focusing its attention on locating the NATO Training Centre over the existing northern training area which you can see on the maps I have behind me. The southern area would still continue to be used primarily for low level flying.

In conclusion, I must emphasize that the expansion proposals which I have discussed, and which are being studied to date, are based on the assumption that a full scale training centre would be constructed. However, as we all know, nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks and belt-tightening exercises. Military programs are certainly not exempt from this. As actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead for the future of military flying activity in Labrador and Quebec.

I thank you Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and I would be certainly pleased to take any questions pertaining to my presentation and the two proposals that are under review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

We would ask anyone who would like to ask a question to use of the two floor standing microphones in the middle of the room, and to clearly state your name for the record before you begin your question.

This presentation has almost always generated some questions. I am a little surprised. However, if not, thank you very much Major, I appreciate that. There may be time later on. If a question comes to somebody in the meantime, I will indicate if we have some time available and you can come forward at that time.

Go ahead, sir.

MR. JOHN KENNEDY: Yes, sir, my name is John Kennedy.

I am curious to find out a little bit more about the coastal bombing ranges. Is there, at the present time, any idea of exactly where these will be located?

THE CHAIRMAN: Major, would you care to reply to that please.

MAJOR McCABE: No, there is not. As I mentioned, the detailed planning and design of the Centre, once they have a better idea of what would take place at it, that is yet to be done. That would go on during the following two years, once the site location was identified.

MR. KENNEDY: From comparative experience elsewhere, can you tell us approximately how large an area would be used by these bombing ranges?

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, I do not like to use the term bombing ranges, because the majority of the activity in them is really just flying against ships. When I mentioned some of the aircraft using weapons against a target towed, it is normally guns and rockets, not really bombs. However, it is difficult to give an actual size. I do have a map which shows some of the current areas. There is a large one, for example, right off Halifax harbour which is used by the Navy quite a bit. It is subsectioned and everything else, and various areas can be used as required. It is really difficult to say, and of course it would not be used all the time.

MR. KENNEDY: One final comment. To what extent would public access, that is to say individual use of areas around these coastal ranges, be prohibited by their existence?

MAJOR McCABE: Normally, again using the example of the current ranges, when a range is going to be active for some kind of activity, a notification is put out -- it is called a NOTAM -- for airmen, and there is also one put out for shipping in sufficient time before hand for people to adjust shipping lanes, et cetera, and they are used for just a few hours at a time.

During the actual activity itself, if there happen to be weapons involved, then use or access to the public is prohibited during that period. Does that answer your question?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, it does.

MS JOANNE CAG: Inter-Church Commission on the Impact of Resource Development.

I have a question about the review procedure and methodology. Could you clarify whether or not you will know by the time the Guidelines come out for this EIS what the precise needs of the Tactical Weapons Training base will be? In other words, will you be able to look at the impact of the required services bases, or will you have to deal with scenarios?

MAJOR McCABE: That is a bit of a problem. In fact, I do not think the Panel itself was aware of it when we first made contact with them. There is a concern that the military has been sort of deliberately sketchy about the plans. It is not so at all. The big problem with this is that it is a proposal, it is an idea. What we are looking at, and what we will be looking at during the study, is to take the Phase I Report, which is the maximum size and which, one could say, would provide the greatest impact or the greatest effect. That is what they are going to be examining. I personally believe that the size of the centre as it is scoped is not realistic. I do not think it would be that big. However, until the centre is actually designed, it will be difficult to tell. We are trying to cover everything they are talking about. Some of it may not even come there. In fact, the design of the centre would be influenced by the results of that study. If, for example, there was a particular activity which, as a result of the Environmental Impact Statement, said this really cannot go on here, then it probably would not.

MS CAG: I am concerned about the accuracy of impacts, and particularly the socio-economic impacts in terms of job creation, infra-structural costs and things like that. I am wondering how are you going to be able to give the public an accurate reading if you can only give them the worst scenario conditions?

MAJOR McCABE: It is a good question. In fact we can only do our best on it. Hopefully we will have more information as the planning goes on. But, for example, we have a better idea of the expansion of the current activity, and we are focusing a lot of attention on that. The NATO centre is being looked at, but as I mentioned in my presentation, when those figures come out we have to caution people that they are based on this kind of thing. There are no promises involved, or anything else.

MS CAG: It is good to hear that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, the questioner at the back. Would you state your name please.

MR. PETER ARMITAGE: My name is Peter

Armitage. I have about three questions.

I apologize for coming in late, and in fact you might have said something that I have missed prior to my arrival.

The first question is: Could you tell me what the Norwegian Air Force was doing in Happy Valley-Goose Bay last summer?

My second question is: Does the U.S. Army have plans to do any training with helicopters in say, for example, simulated tank attacks in the near future, the next five years or so?

The third question is: How many low level flights are there at present in the northern and southern low level flight training zones?

My last question is: Do you know of any recent agreements between the Canadian government and the West German government to allow for a massive and immediate expansion of low level flight training in each of those two zones?

Okay, four questions.

MAJOR McCABE: Let me see if I can remember them all.

First of all, the Norwegian Air Force was not in Goose Bay. The Dutch and Belgian Air Forces did a two week training period there this summer. By Norwegians, do you mean having aircraft over there?

MR. ARMITAGE: I saw a picture, either in the Northern Distorter or the Labradorian, there was a picture of three Norwegian tents. I was wondering what the purpose of those tents was. Was it some kind of training activity that was associated with the location of those tents, or was the news report incorrect?

MAJOR McCABE: I am not aware, myself, of there being Norwegians there at any time. To say there have been the other two countries, which some people get confused about sometimes. I have heard mention before about Norway being involved in training at Goose Bay, but they have never expressed any interest in that. So I think that is possibly an error.

Okay, these probably will not be in order.

MR. ARMITAGE: The U.S. Army training with helicopters.

MAJOR McCABE: Okay. The only U.S. interest has been more from the U.S. Navy, and a little from their air defence people. For example, we have an annual exercise -- it was not held this year -- which is normally held each year, and it involves air defence forces from Canada and the United States. I have not heard any interest expressed or requests for the kind of training activity that you are talking about, none whatsoever.

MR. ARMITAGE: Okay, the third question is in reference to the present numbers of low level flight training.

MAJOR McCABE: Okay, I do not know the actual breakdown, of course. The majority of flying that is done there is in a low level environment. I do not know the breakdown between the two areas. What normally governs the use of those often is weather. I do know that the season has just finished. The Germans, for example, I believe did slightly under 3,000 sorties, about 2,900-plus sorties. The Royal Air Force has just finished, I think last week, and I am not sure what their statistics are. They are lower because the Germans had more aircraft there. But that gives you a rough idea.

I would suggest there were probably about between 4,000 to 4,500 low level flights, I guess.

MR. ARMITAGE: In total?

What percentage of those flights are night-time and all weather flights?

MAJOR McCABE: Very few, in actual fact. We do some night flying, and it is just the Tornado aircraft that do any, what we call poor weather or bad weather flying.

MR. ARMITAGE: Have any low level passes been made at night over the community of Sheshatshit, do your knowledge?

MAJOR McCABE: Not to my knowledge. It is a restricted area.

I might add that it is just off the

approach to the runway, so it is possible that coming in on a radar approach that may have been the case. I do not know.

MR. ARMITAGE: The last question then is: To your knowledge, do you know of any recent agreements between the Canadian government and the West German government to permit an immediate and significant expansion of low level flight training?

MAJOR McCABE: No. That is one of the things that is being examined as one of the two proposals I mentioned. They have indicated a desire to increase the training; not a large increase. They are, as are the other nations, limited in the number of aircraft and personnel we can have there at any one time under that multinational memorandum of understanding that I mentioned.

THE CHAIRMAN; Are there any other questions? I think we will end the question period at this point, and I will suggest that if we have any time later we will entertain a few more.

I failed to mention before that we are providing simultaneous interpretation for the two official languages here today. For those of you who were not already aware of that fact, receivers are available at the back of the room free of charge.

We have posted the list of intervenors including all the names provided to us by mid-day today. That list is posted on the third door on the side of the room for anyone who would care to look at it. That is to be regarded as the official list. I mention that because it has been brought to my attention that there was a list of intervenors for this meeting provided early today to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation under rather mysterious circumstances, and if one were to look at it quickly one might have thought that it was published by the Panel or by the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. That in fact is not the case. That was not published by the Panel or the office, and we have no knowledge of who put it together or the source of the information.

The one and only official intervenors' list is posted on the door here in this room.

Again, I would remind speakers of the limitation of a maximum of 20 minutes each. There may be a few questions from the Panel depending on the nature of the presentation. I will keep the number of questions in line with the overall time limit that we have here today.

As I stated before, the main purpose of these meetings is to hear presentations offering constructive criticism on the contents of the Draft Guidelines document. We have always had time in the other meetings we have held already to hear some other types of presentations. Given the time limits we have today, I would ask everyone to cooperate and please try to direct your comments mainly towards the Draft Guidelines.

If there is any time left at the end of

the session tonight, then we will have an open, spontaneous question period.

We do plan to have a coffee break about half-way through the afternoon, and another one tonight.

To begin with the scheduled list of intervenors then, we are to hear first from the Inter-Church Commission. Would the speaker come forward please.

Would you please identify yourselves for the record, and for the audience.

MS JOANNE CAG: I am Joanne Cag. I work for the United Church Council of Social Ministries and I a United Church representative on the Inter-Church Commission on Resource Development.

MR. HAROLD HISCOCK: I am Secretary of the Inter-Church Commission.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. HAROLD HISCOCK and MS JOANNE CAG-

MR. HISCOCK: I have distributed a letter which we sent earlier, a month or so ago, to the Panel, and we want, at this point, to raise some of the issues that were raised in this letter. And it references the Draft Guidelines.

First of all we would like to thank the Panel for coming here to St. John's. I think this indicates that this issue, although one of a lot of local importance, recognizes that there are people immediately outside the impacted area that have concerns about this issue.

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

We were basically quite pleased, and thought the Draft Guidelines to be fairly comprehensive. There are some omissions, and a few points we would like clarified.

I should say, in respect to your coming here to St. John's and holding a hearing in Montreal, that for the Inter-Church Commission and for other church bodies particularly, we find that there are economic development proposals going to areas in Canada where there is a certain amount of lack of choice because of economic necessity, and for that reason we think that the voices of people outside the impacted area should be heard.

The first point we want to raise is public participation in the process, and we will speak specifically about intervenor funding. There was a letter from the Minister on July 29th indicating that the matter was under review and that an announcement would be made soon.

We would like to know from the Panel about intervenor funding, who will be able to qualify for it, and what further you might have on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: That matter the Panel has left in the hands of the Secretariat as far as the day to day thing is concerned. To the best of my knowledge, the setting up of a system of funding for intervenors is progressing well. There certainly will be intervenor funding. The way in which it will be administered I believe is to have appointed an interdepartmental committee. I have no information on who may be on that committee yet, but it will be independent of the Panel, independent of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office and will be in a position to receive applications for intervenor funding and to determine which of the applicants would get how much of that funding.

I understand that there will be an announcement very soon about that. I wonder if Mr. Martin has any further information? Nothing specific about a date for that announcement? No. Thank you. So that is all we know at the present time. There will be funding. There will be an announcement soon, and I understand it will be of a rather generous nature.

MS CAG: The first part of our letter dealt with process. We have been through the Hiberia process, and found it very unsatisfactory from an intervenor's perspective and also in terms of the follow-up work that comes out of it in planning and implementing either mitigative measures, as they are called in the jargon, or encouraging community involvement in the management of a development proposal. We made one suggestion in our letter on a way that the Panel might alter the FEARO process to encourage more and better cooperation between community and proponent and government on management of the controversial developments, such as this one.

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

We would like to know if you have any kind of leeway at this point to follow such suggestions. The one we have presented primarily falls from work that has done on the "not in my backyard" syndrome, which is probably not the problem here. But we still think it is a good idea to try to get some concensus on both the acceptance of data, information gaps, feasibility of mitigative measures and community involvement and management prior to a public debate on the EIS.

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, it is a little difficult to react to this at the present time. You may be aware that the Panel has been on the road with brief intervals back home since early September, and we are receiving a great deal of information both in the meetings and by mail. To be quite honest, we have not had the time to sit down and start going through this. But what we have said in response to other suggestions that have come to us in previous meetings is that next month, when we sit down to consider the final form of the Guidelines, at the same time we will look at all related questions that we are getting now, and make some decision on them. Certainly your suggestion for improvement in the process is welcome. I think that all panels in the past have attempted to improve the process for their particular review, and we would like to think we can be as creative as any panel in the past. So we will certainly look at your suggestion. We have

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

a certain amount of scope. We are expected to follow certain basic procedural rules laid down in the Order-in-Council in which we operate, but beyond that I think we have leeway to be creative, and we will certainly pay attention to your suggestion.

MR. HISCOCK: On a value ecosystem approach, which comes up referencing four methodological considerations, 4.1, we were pleased to see that this approach was going to take place, but we are not very clear on what it means. We understand that there are different understandings and different values given to an ecosystem that a Native person would probably have one, a business person in Happy Valley may have another, and a church based group may very well have another.

Are there precedents for using this approach in environmental hearings? And how would you rank divergent values? I suppose what I am asking for is a discussion around it, although we do not want to use up all our time on this one thing. Could you make some comment, especially as it has been used before in the environmental hearing process, to your knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it has been used at all, it has not been used very much. It is a relatively new concept, as you ar eprobably aware, and came out of a report by Dr. Beanlands and Mr. Duinker a few years ago.

First of all, I would like everyone to

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

understand that when we say ecosystem, we mean the entire ecological system, including people and their cultural and social situations, and all that sort of thing.

Beanlands and Duinker's report dealt only with the natural environment, the biophysical environment. So we are perhaps asking a lot when we ask the proponent to take that approach and try to adapt it to the socio-economic situation. I can see a lot of difficulty there. However, we feel that it is necessary.

The next thing to realize is that the Environmental Impact Statement is expected to be, and no doubt will be, a statement by the proponent. It will be the proponent's point of view. In that light, we would expect the proponent to identify the valued components of the ecosystem, and to the best of his ability set out the criteria for the ranking of the values of those components. We would certainly expect those to reflect the proponent's point of view, and given, as you say, there might be different values assigned by certain other interested parties, those other parties will be quite welcome to agree or disagree with the proponent's choice of ranking and the cirteria for ranking. That is the way the process works.

I would expect the proponent to look very carefully at the various interests of the other parties that may be affected by the project, and to use the best judgement that you can in coming up with the system that you would use to identify and address the components. Beyond that, I do not know that I can say any more without getting into a much longer discussion than we have time for here.

MR. HISCOCK: We do see it as being a very, very helpful way of proceeding given the situation in this case.

Just to carry on, in examining the economic development in the impacted areas, we would like to suggest that the proponent examine the potential for economic under-development in non-impacted areas, i.e. demographic shifts and related impacts which may be felt along the Labrador coast.

A comparative analysis of under-development in non-impacted areas from a similar project would be helpful in this case. And we put that forward as a suggestion, but quite often in an instance of a large project coming into an area, you will get a lot of shifts of people, and you might have 100 new housing starts in Happy Valley. What will that mean to the communities from which these people are coming. I would suggest that that be taken into account as well.

I will carry on. We are referencing here point 5(5) in the Guidelines, the impacts on the natural environment, and we would like here to include an analysis of the impact of the population increase on the natural environment. The figures were given a little while ago, probably some 4,000 to 5,000 people, and they would all have access, or a good many of them would, to Ski-doo's, TV's and so forth, and we are thinking of the subsistence living of Native and other peoples in the area. A lot of these people will be engaged in recretational activities. So, we think that ought to be taken into account in terms of the natural environment.

MS CAG: Point 5(9), dealing with the issue of land claims: We understand from our reading of the Guidelines that intervenors can raise the question of whether or not proceeding with the project will have an effect on future land claims negotiations. It is also our understanding that the Berger Commission, for instance, in its treatment of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline did conclude so. So we take it as a given that the project will have an effect on land claims. Now we want to know how the Panel will proceed within its own scope and mandate? We are being very unclear because we are not sure where it leaves the Panel. You have issued guidelines to say that we can raise the question of the effect this development will have on land claims, but cannot raise the issue of land claims itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have not been asked to deliberate on the policy of the Government of Canada under which it carries on negotiations with the Native people concerning land claims. We have put in the Guidelines the items relating to its impact on the outcome of such negotiations because many people have said to us, and we have realized ourselves, that that is a very important issue that has to be addressed.

We would handle this in the same way as other types of impacts if it is pointed out, either in the Impact Statement or in some other way during the review, to the Panel that in fact the outcome of negotiations will somehow be affected by the project, then the Panel will have to reach a conclusion on how serious that impact is likely to be, and to make a recommendation to the government concerning that expected impact along with all other kinds of impacts and trust that the government, since it is looking for recommendations concerning the environmental effects would take note of that and take some action to deal with the impact. That may be a very over-simplified answer at this stage of the game, but I think at this early stage that is all I can say.

MS CAG: I guess we raised it because since we submitted this we have known that there is a recommendation from the Standing Committee on Forestry and Environment which asked the National Defence Minister to reserve judgement on low level flight training until native land claims have been dealt with. We also know that the Royal Commission

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

on Employment and Unemployment has issued a recommendation to the provincial government concerning these activities.

I think we felt like it is good, but we do not know how the process that we are engaged in here would help deal with the problem.

In any event, I will leave it to you to ponder.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me say that I think the Panel is coming to realize that the unsettled nature of land claims, both in Quebec and in Labrador, is one of the root causes of some of the problems that exist in that area, not only with respect to military flying activities, but to other sorts of developments. I do not think any of us on the Panel feel that we are wizards, that we are going to find a ready solution for this any more than any people have been able to find one. We will just have to decide what we want to say in our report at the end of this exercise on that subject.

MR. HISCOCK: I think we are pleased, in spite of your being unable to address land claims directly, you will address it indirectly.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is policy that we are not asked to deliberate on.

MR. HISCOCK: Moving along to point 6.1 in the Guidelines, we think the summary should include a clear description of the economic costs of the

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

of the development. So often we hear about the benefits. We would like to see a cost benefit analysis and actually try to pinpoint who are going to bear some of the costs of this project, and who will bear some of the benefits. We think there should be an equal break-down there.

Point 6.2 on justification and need for the project. I got kind of confused with the language here between "justification" and "need". Will intervenors have access to current NATO agreements, and Canada's NATO commitments? If you were going to be assessing justification and need, we feel we should be able to do the same thing, and we wonder if we will have access to those kinds of documents and agreements.

How will the public be able to assess justification if alternative Canadian defence strategies are excluded from the scope of the review?

Again, I think we are into an area here where you have brought up an area in these Guidelines that just seem a bit unclear to us; how we can proceed as intervenors without ...

MS CAG: Without having ourselves disqualified.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, as you say, the defence policy of Canada is another one of those areas which certain participants in the review would seem to think constitute very important issues that

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

perhaps should be addressed, but which this Panel has not been asked to deliberate on or advise government on. We have been asked to look at this proposal and its expected impacts within the context of the existing defence policy of the country.

As to which documents might be available to us, I really do not know the answer to whether we will have access to NATO agreements and that sort of thing. We have not asked for them yet, so I guess we will find out when we ask. I do not know if, in the meantime, Major McCabe would be able to say something to that. Will you, Major?

You would not care to at the moment. Very good, thank you.

By the way, I am allowing you a little extra time because I can see I am taking up part of your time. Would you go ahead now, please.

MR. HISCOCK: We will rush on through here.

Point 6.2.4, future phases of the project: Comparative data of similar developments. I think you have asked that there be some comparative data. We think it should include an historic perspective. This was considered the original projection for site development compared to the actual development of the project, with particular reference to the introduction of new technologies and new and changing military strategies over the life of the project.

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

References should also include potentia bilateral agreements with the U.S. in light of the present direction of American defensive initiatives in northern Canada.

What we are essentially asking for here is, if we look at a comparative project, we think we should look at something probably that started in 1950, and what had been projected up to 1970, and then given some new technologies and new defensive strategic changes in defensive needs and requirements because, even as Major McCabe had pointed out, there have been quite a few changes and some new technologies introduced since 1981. What we are wondering is: How accurately DND can project for 20 years' time given some of these variables. In other words, we think that kind of comparison should be looked at, and I think might be helpful for us.

Point 6.3 describes copies of a project description available to the public. Is it available? We do not have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. What there is is called the Referral Document that was sent to the Minister from the Associate Minister of Defence in February of this year. It consists of a covering letter backed up with a description of the project in a fairly general way, as it was seen at that point. Some things may have changed since that time, but that document is certainly available from our office.

Hiscock and Cag, Sub.

The Panel has looked at it and found out that a lot more information on the project is needed. The Panel has written a letter to the Department of National Defence and we have been told that that letter is being considered at the present time, and that certain of the information asked for in that letter is being prepared, and we would expect to receive it in the not too distant future. For the time being, the only project description available is in that Referral Document, and you can certainly get a copy by speaking to one of the members of the Secretariat.

MS CAG: I understand that there is to be a project description prepared following the NATO decision on site. Would that one be made available to intervenors or to the Panel? It would seem to me that it is really necessary in order to prepare Guidelines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major, would you like to say something about that please.

MAJOR McCABE: I agree. I think that this kind of document we are talking about, the scoping, I do not really see why it would be particularly classified. If there were some areas that got down to some specific equipment or whatever then that might have to be cut out. But I do not see why there would be any hesitation to let the public know. That is part of the whole process.

MS CAG: Point 6.3.1 deals -- I have not

Hiscock and Caq, Sub.

got my Guidelines so I am remembering it -- with mitigative measures concerning over-straying. We would like to see the EIS include a description and documentation of straying incidents since 1980, and with it a discussion of how effective present procedures have been in mitigating or preventing these.

We have heard the Major say repeatedly that an area is restricted, or these flights should not occur. But we have also heard that they do occur and we would like to be able to examine the effectiveness of current regulations.

In terms of 6.3.1(xv), again we would like to insure that the economic benefit analysis indicates who may be expected to receive the benefits.

In 6.3.2 we would like the manpower requirements to have a detailed assessment of local labour supply and employment category. This assessment should also describe available facilities for the training and upgrading of local residents, including pertinent DND progress for civilian personnel training.

Number 6.3.2(ii); we understand from the Major's statements today, and others, that there would need to be resupply routings, as you called it, for both construction and maintenance of the base. We would like some idea of how this would affect other modes of transportation, specifically shipping and rail. As I understand it, there have been previous attempts made to look at keeping that port open year 'round. We have concerns about what that would do to subsistence activity, and the environmental effect of that. We do not want just to know how they are going to supply their needs, we would like to know if they are going to displace other users in doing so. Rather, we would like the users to know.

In 6.3.2.(iii) we want to know if the description of the infrastructural needs will be compared to existing municipal facilities. For instances, will it address the impact on housing stocks, prices, school capacity, et cetera.

Again, we would like to see the local economic benefits analysis describe who would bear the cost for this infrastructure either in this or in dealing with impacts.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you and thank you for staying pretty well within your appointed time.

The next scheduled speaker is Mr. Peter Armitage.

Could I ask, sir, if you are speaking personally or behalf of an organization?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. PETER ARMITAGE:

MR. ARMITAGE: I am speaking as an individual.

Armitage, Sub.

Before I get into the meat of the matter I just want to give you a bit of biography. I have been working as an anthropologist among the Innu people of Quebec and Labrador for the last six years. My field work experience with them includes trips to the communities, and extended field work periods in the communities of Sheshatshit, Labrador, La Romaine on the Quebec north short, Mingan on the Quebec north shore, Sept-Iles on the Quebec north shore and the community of Schefferville.

Also, while I was living with the Innu I had an opportunity to spend six months living in the country with them at a location called Lac des Loups, about 90 miles north of the community of La Romaine, and while I was there I had the opportunity to witness their continuing extensive use of the land and, in fact, in stark contrast to what Mr. Hank Shouse, the Mayor of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, says, the Innu do continue to use the land extensively and I witnessed that fact. At least one meal per day that I ate while I was in the country with them for three months consisted of some kind of bush food: Caribou, porcupine, beaver and so forth.

So that is a brief introduction.

I would like to start by commending you for the generally good quality of the Draft Guidlines prepared for the Department of National Defence's Environmental Impact Statement. The Guidelines indicate

Armitage, Sub.

indicate that you have a relatively good grasp of what is in store for the Quebec-Labrador peninsula as a result of expanding air combat training activities whether these occur through bilateral agreements or the construction of a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre.

However, I believe there are a number of inadequacies with the Draft Guidelines as they presently stand, and some are quite serious in nature.

In my submission to you today, I would like to outline what these serious inadequacies are, and then advance three hypotheses about the impacts of expanding air combat training that the Department of National Defence should address in its EIS.

Number one: Inadequacies with the FEARO Draft Guidelines. In my view the Draft Guidelines are deficient for the following reasons: (a) the scope of the review is too restricted because there is no mandate to deal with land claims policy. The Panel has no mandate with the subject of federal land claims policy, and cannot therefore properly assess the impact of the expanding military presence in the Quebec-Labrador peninsula on aboriginal rights and land claims. The Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association and the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council have already pointed out to you the serious prejudice that the military expansion in Ntesinan is causing to Innu aboriginal rights and land claims. The increasing

Armitage, Sub.

number of third party interests on Innu land will make it extremely difficult for the Innu represented by the NMIA, Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais and the Maliotenam/Seven Islands Band Council to negotiate their land claims. Land preselection in the context of such negotiation and the achievement of political jurisdiction over land are seriously impaired by allowing major developments to take place prior to the signing of a land claims agreement.

I do not wish to belabour this point, but I think it is extremely important that the scope of the FEARO review be expanded so that comment can be made on federal land claims policy. As you are well aware, the NMIA is not one of the sic Native groups that may actively negotiate land claims. This is a direct result of present land claims policy entitled "In All Fairness", but there is nothing fair about a policy that forces an indiginous population to sit helplessly on the sidelines while governments pretend their land claims and aboriginal rights do not exist, and invite all kinds of third party interests to set up shop in their territory.

I want to reiterate in the strongest possible terms the need for a change in present federal land claims policy, so that active negotiations can commence with the Innu who are represented by the NMIA. I see a land claims agreement as the best possible way to resolve the on-going conflict between

Armitage, Sub.

the Innu of Quebec-Labrador and the military.

Point 2: FEARO cannot question the Department of National Defence's assertions for the need for the project. Here I strongly object to the comments made in the section of the Draft Guidelines entitled "Project Justification" at page 16. The Guidelines state that: "It is important for the Panel to understand the reasons for the project in order to weight adequately the environmental and socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the project."

The Panel is going to accept, without criticism, DND's definition of the situation. That is, DND's judgement of the need for the project. It will then use this judgement to help it weigh the pros and cons of proceeding with the project. To me this is totally unacceptable. DND has been given too much power here to influence the decision-making by the FEARO Panel concerning whether or not to proceed with the military expansion. The Panel must be allowed to critique DND's judgement of the need for the project, and the public must also be allowed to challenge DND's assertions of the need for this project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, sir, if I may interrupt for a second. I will give you some extra time.

On what do you base the conclusion that

Armitage, Sub.

we are going to accept, without criticism, the definitio of DND regarding the situation. As I said a few minutes ago, the Impact Statement is regarded as a statement of the proponent. It is not expected to be a totally objective document. What has led you to feel that we will not question that if we feel like questioning it.

MR. ARMITAGE: Because you say that it is outside your mandate to assess the need for the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no. It is outside our mandate to deliberate on Canada's defence policy.

There are several exclusions from our mandate. One is Canada's defence policy. Another is Canada's policy on Native land claims. While it is true that we are expected to deliberate within the framework of the existing defence policy, there is nothing to say that the Panel cannot question the need for this particular project if the Panel feels moved to do so.

Without taking up too much time, I would question your conclusion in this regard.

MR. ARMITAGE: I got that out of the section 6.2.2 saying that the Panel is not mandated to pass judgement on the need for the project. The way I interpreted that was that you basically have to accept whatever DND said about the need for the project, and that the public is not allowed to make

Armitage, Sub.

input or to give any kind of critical appraisal itself about what DND says about the need for that project: Page 16, "The Panel is not mandated to pass judgement on the need for the proposed project."

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this may be a wording thing here. What we are saying is that it is up to the Department of National Defence to decide whether or not Canada needs this project.

The Panel, as I say, may feel that it needs to go back for further information once it has seen what is in the Impact Statement. I do not think we intended to state here that we were going to accept unquestioningly the need for the project.

MR. ARMITAGE: Great. So then you will also accept public input into the need.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will hear comments from anyone on that subject.

MR. ARMITAGE: Okay. If that is the case, that meets my objection on this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Keeping in mind, as I say, that the defence policy of the country is not up for discussion.

MR. ARMITAGE: Okay, thank you.

Another point here then is that the FEARO must have the mandate to call for the termination of low level flying if negative impacts are identified. As I see it at the moment, the FEARO Panel can recommend that the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter

Armitage, Sub.

Weapons Training Centre not be built if serious negative impacts are identified. However, the FEARO Panel cannot recommend that the present low level flying program, under bilateral agreements, be terminated if serious negative impacts are identified. In this latter case, the Panel can only recommend mitigative measures. It seems to me that to have any credibitility whatsoever, the FEARO Panel must also have the mandate to recommend termination of all low level flight training activities if serious negative impacts are identified.

Just an aside here: I think it is highly irresponsible of the federal government to continue to pursue additional bilateral agreements for low level flying with its NATO allies, when it has only just started its assessment into the impacts of this flying. For example, an agreement between Canada and the Netherlands could be signed at any moment now to permit the Dutch to conduct low level flying over a 10-year period with F-16 aircraft.

The Canadian government is also encouraging the West German government to conduct more low level flying out of Goose Bay. And, Major McCabe, you should pay attention to what I have to say here. On September 8, 1986 the West German Secretary of State, Mr. Wurzbach, announced in the West German Bundestag, or parliament, that the Canadian and West German governments had just signed

Armitage, Sub.

a new agreement to permit a 60 per cent increase in German Air Force low level flights in Quebec and Labrador. German Air Force low level flights will be increased to 6,000 per year "once the necessary infrastructure is in place." And, as you mentioned, the approximate level of low level flying in 1985 was about 4,000 low level flights per year by all NATO air forces.

So here we have the Canadian government agreeing to an immediate imminent increase to 6,000 low level flights per year just by the German Air Force.

It seems to me, in reality, that the Canadian government is not fully committed to the FEARO review process, and that it will not accept any recommendations that call for a substantial curtailment of military air combat training operations in Quebec and Labrador. Why is the Canadian government actively encouraging the rapid expansion of military air combat training in Quebec-Labrador when it does not even know what the negative impacts of this training are? If the Canadian government is sincerely concerned about the impacts of air combat training on health and environment, then it should impose an immediate moratorium on all such training, including low level flight training, until such time as the results of the FEARO review are complete. And I suggest to you that the FEARO Panel should ask the

Armitage, Sub.

federal government to impose a moratorium on all air combat training activities in the Quebec-Labrador peninsula immediately.

The third point: The Draft Guidlines do not require the Department of National Defence to assess in its EIS the environment health impacts of radio frequency radiation. I have a number of documents in that package that I gave you that back up what I am going to be saying.

I would like to tell you, right from the onset, that I am no expert on the health effects of radio frequency radiation. I am a social scientist, not a natural scientist, and I never got my arithmetic straight from the very beginning. But I have managed to learn enough about radio frequency radiation to know that there could be some negative health effects resulting from exposure to certain kinds of radio frequency radiation.

Just before I go into this topic any further, let me define radio frequency radiation. We have all heard of ionizing radiation. This is the kind of radiation that is given off in large quantities in nuclear explosions, and when we get our teeth X-rayed that is another kind of ionizing radiation that we are being exposed to.

But another kind of radiation is non-ionizing radiation, or radio frequency radiation, that is emitted from radio and microwave transmitters,

Armitage, Sub.

radars, electric power lines, microwave ovens, video display terminals, earth to satellite transmitters and so forth. Now there is some evidence to suggest that RF radiation, radio frequency radiation, can have deleterious effects on human health that include cataracts and retina damage, pancreatic cancer, endocrine disorders, premature senility -- maybe I have some of that — behaviourial problems, diseases involving white blood cells, birth defects, genetic damage and so forth. My brief review of just a small amount of the literature on the subject indicates that the most common health problem attributed to RF radiation is cataracts.

I am providing you with copies of most of the information I have in my possession concerning the health impacts of RF radiation. I believe that this information should provide sufficient cause for a thorough assessment of the kinds of military equipment to be used in Quebec-Labrador that emit RF radiation. Please note here that I am not the first person to call for an assessment of possible health impacts from RF radiation associated with military air combat training. The Conseil Attikamek-Montagnais in its submission to you, on September 2 and 3 in La Romaine, identified RF radiation as a possible health impact that must be investigated. I think you received a copy of this hefty document in La Romaine, and this is a concern that is identified

Armitage, Sub.

in there. The CAM submission noted, however, that national security considerations might impair a proper evaluation of such radiation. The data on RF radiation emission on various kinds of jamming equipment on aircraft or from ground based threat emitters, for example, might very well be classified information. Also, I might add here that Rural Coalition and Citizen Alert, which are groups fighting military air combat training in the United States, have also identified radio frequency radiation as a possible health hazard.

I would like to draw your attention to the document included there entitled Microwave News, a monthly report on non-ionizing radiation. It is interesting to note that the various suits filed in the United States claiming damages for health problems attributed to exposure to RF radiation. I am not going to read them all out here. One will suffice. "Attorney Richard Leonard is preparing a case for a former B-47 aircraft crew member. His client alleges one hour of close range exposure to an electronic countermeasures device mounted under a plane caused severe injuries."

Now I want you to consider two quotations, the first from a book called Red Flag about the military air combat manoeuvres based out of Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, and the second called the United States Air Force in Europe: A

Armitage, Sub.

Primer of Modern Air Combat in Europe. "Every aircraft must keep at least 3,000 feet from the E-3A AWACS, EA-6B and the new EF-111. Actually, pilots probably would not want to get any closer to these last three aircraft for fear of being sterilized by their powerful microwave transmissions. One counter to agile radars is barrage jamming, transmitting jamming power across several frequencies, but this takes an enormous amount of power and is usually reserved for larger, more specialized planes like the AWACS. Its AN/APY-1 radar is so powerful the crew must shut it off two miles before tanker rendezvous or risk igniting the tanker's fuel load with microwave emissions. It is a tempting target, radiating huge amounts of power over five hundred miles."

The author of these words, Michael Skinner, may very well be a raving lunatic and simply dreaming up all of these comments about sterilization and igniting fuel loads. However, to reiterate, I believe there is enough information there to warrant concern and to justify an in-depth assessment of the possible health hazards of military use of radio frequency radiation, and I would suggest that you start by studying the effect of RF radiation from surveillance and electronic counter measures aircraft such as E-3A, EA-6B, EF-111 and Phantom II F-4G Wild Weasel, as well as ground based radars, threat emitters and scoring systems for combat training.

Armitage, Sub.

If the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is to be built in Goose Bay, it may be necessary in the case of ground based sources of radio frequency radiation to cordon off radar stations, scoring systems threat emitters so that people and animals do not approach too closely.

I think you should include an assessment of radio frequency radiation just so we can be 100 per cent certain that there are no negative health impacts stemming from exposure to such radiation.

I want to present to you three hypotheses briefly, because it seems to me that you are going to ask the Department of National Defence to come up with hypotheses about particular impacts. Am I correct? So I suggest to you now three hypotheses that I think you should forward to the Department of National Defence.

The first one is that much of the Quebec-Labrador peninsula will be made uninhabitable by these kinds of training activities, particularly the areas where extremely low level flight training zones are located. I say that these areas will be rendered unfit for human habitation. This will occur due to extremely loud and unexpected noise generated from the following sources: more low level flights; more low level flights at night; low level and higher altitude supersonic flights that will generate frequent sonic booms. In addition, certain areas of

Armitage, Sub.

the peninsula will be permanently removed from public access so that tactical weapons ranges may be built there. As we have heard, and According to Colonel George McArthur of DND's Air Planning Directorate, the full range of conventional weapons will be used on these ranges. It remains to be seen what per centage of that training will involve live ammunition use. I say the weapons range facilities associated with both Cold Lake Air Force Base in Alberta and with Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada are closed to public access, an I would like to know the total area of land that will be eliminated from public access as a result of bilateral agreements, as well as the construction of a NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre.

The second hypotheses is that military aircraft cannot avoid Innu camps or hunting parties despite claims by the Canadian Armed Forces. I am happy to see in the Draft Guidelines, in fact, in Section 6.3.1, page 19, that you are asking for information on "the pattern of flight paths that have been used within the low level flying areas in the past six years, the frequency of use of each flight path and the reasons for annual variations in patterns."

It is reasonable to suggest that low level flying and sonic booms will be experienced in higher frequencies in particular portions of the

Armitage, Sub.

Quebec-Labrador peninsula, particularly those portions where tactical weapons ranges or instrumented air combat manoeuvering ranges are located.

As a hypotheses, I would like to put the following argument to you. The argument is that in much of the peninsula, in particular where the extremely low level flying zones are located, it will be impossible to avoid Innu camps and hunting parties. Please note here that the Canadian Armed Forces claims it can reduce the negative impact of low level flying on the Innu by getting the pilots to treat the Innu camps like enemy surface-to-air missile installations, and to avoid them because of this. The reasons why Innu camps and hunting parties cannot be avoided are: (1) the Innu do not sit idly on their rear ends all day at the main camps. The men, including boys, may travel long distances from the base camp to check traps and distant beaver lodges or follow caribou tracks. I would say that the average distance that men and boys travel away from base camp is about eight miles per day, and women and children also travel considerable distances away from the main camp.

Another reason for why the NATO airdraft cannot avoid Innu camps is because I believe that low level flight training will expand to a significant level. It is worthy of our note here that, at the moment, there are about 133,000 low level

Armitage, Sub.

flights per year in Great Britain. In West Germany there are about 110,000 low level flights per year, and that if, in fact, we import to Quebec-Labrador a small percentage of these low level flight training activities, we are going to see a significant increase. I say with that kind of low level air combat training taking place in the region, it will be impossible to avoid Innu camps.

Also here we have a problem with pilot discipline. We have reports already of pilots hot-dogging over Innu camps. That is, when they locate an Innu camp or a hunting party on a lake, they purposely redirect their aircraft over those camps or hunting parties, and then stand their aircraft on end, kick in their afterburners and go flying straight up into the air. I say that there is extensive documentation on poor pilot discipline, and I give you some examples there in a document that I put before you today.

Also we have a problem with supersonic booms, and that is that even if the aircraft are some distance away from the camps, people are still likely to experience problems with sonic booms. We know from the experience of people in the south-western U. S. states of Utah and New Mexico and Texas and Nevada, supersonic aircraft produce frequent carpet sonic booms, and even more intense focus and superfocus booms that crack the walls in houses, blow

Armitage, Sub.

out car windshields and so forth. So, I am happy to see that you have included an assessment of sonic booms on the environment and on people in the region as well.

The last hypothesis is that the survival of the Innu culture will be seriously threatened. Here I concur wholeheartedly with the conclusions that were reached in both the CAM document that was put before you on September 2 and 3, as well as some of the comments that were made by Chief Daniel Ashini of the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council. His conclusion is that basically the Innu will be forced into smaller and smaller portions of the territory where they will be in the only areas where they can escape low level and supersonic air combat training activities. More of them will be forced to reside, more or less permanently, in the communities where they will suffer from all of the horrible social pathologies that are so well documented for those communities. It seems to me that if the Innu are forced off the land in this way, they can only have but one nasty consequence, and that is the destruction of their culture.

To conclude, I would say that the terrible social pathologies that would result from this kind of situation are unacceptable costs to pay for the military expansion, no matter what the benefits of this expansion are. And, finally, I

Armitage, Sub.

would recommend that you forward to DND the three hypotheses outlined here, and ask it to provide detailed arguments to answer the problems identified in each one. In other words, ask DND to get the various consultants who are preparing its Environmental Impact Statement to determine: (1) whether or not people can live in areas where military air combat training will occur; (2) whether or not NATO aircraft can avoid Innu camps and hunting parties in the country; and (3) whether or not it would be possible for the young people to continue the harvesting activities in the country in the face of such air combat training.

I will conclude my presentation at that point, and I thank you very much for your attention. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Armitage.

We will now take a short coffee break, and reconvene at 4:00 o'clock. Thank you.

---Short recess

---Upon resuming at 4:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now resume the meeting for this afternoon. Our next speaker will be Mr. John Kennedy.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JOHN KENNEDY:

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

My name is John Kennedy, and I am with

Kennedy, Sub.

the Native Peoples' Support Group of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Native Peoples' Support Group of Newfoundland and Labrador welcomes this opportunity to present our views on the Draft Guidelines. At the outset, the Support Group believes the Guidelines itemize many of the possible impacts from the project, and we will be following the preparation of the Department of National Defence Environmental Impact Statement closely.

Formed in 1979, the Native Peoples' Support Group is a voluntary organization of about 70 persons concerned with the problems and goals of this province's indiginous peoples. I might interject that, contrary to frequent claims that the groups opposing militarization of Labrador are well funded, I checked with our treasurer this morning and as of October 27, 1986 we are in the best shape we have been in for some time. We have about $1,100 in our budget.

In any event, most of our work, virtually all of it, is volunteer work from a group of people who are very concerned with the issues surrounding Native people.

The Support Group has been concerned with the issue of low level military flying in Quebec and in Labrador since approximately 1983, and particularly we have been concerned with its impact

Kennedy, Sub.

on Quebec and Labrador Innu.

We believe, however, that it is important to emphasize that military flying activities are only the most recent in a series of policies and developments which have undermined the ability of Innu to fully participate and practice their hunting and harvesting way of life. For example, Innu were displaced from part of their land base by the flooding of the Smallwood Reservoir. Innu have also been subjected to continuous harrassment by provincial wildlife authorities, and I might add that we have considerable data on that topic, if the Panel is interested in seeing it. There is considerable data on individual cases of harrassment.

In addition, Innu have had their lifestyle severely compromised by pressures to remain in centralized communities.

We believe that low level military flight training could be the final nail in the coffin of the Innu way of life. Our comments about the draft Guidelines will be presented under two broad headings. I will first outline the Support Group's general recommendations, and then address more specific points which I believe could improve the Guidelines.

General recommendations: Documentary evidence collected during and since World War II suggests that large scale military development in

Kennedy, Sub.

sparsely populated regions produces negative consequences for resident indigenous populations. For example, in the Pacific, Micronesians of Bikini Atoll were forcibly relocated from their island homeland in 1946 so that nuclear testing could occur there. The human misery created by this relocation, the ultimately unsuccessful adjustment of Bikinians to the place where they were relocated, and their sad return to Bikini Atoll is described in detail by Kiste, 1974.

In the Philippines construction and operation of Subic and Clark military bases have reduced the formerly independent local Negrito population to a meagre survival based on handicraft production, scrap collecting and other menial tasks.

Closer to home, construction of Goose Air Base and of the coastal Labrador Pine Tree Radar stations have caused economic and social disruption for both Inuit and especially for Innu, even though some Inuit and Settlers did obtain wage labour at these installations. I might add that the recent backgroud report to the Commission on Employment and Unemployment prepared by Carol Brice-Bennett gives a very detailed account of the impacts of the building of Goose Bay and in fact also of the coastal radar stations, and I highly recommend it to the Panel.

While some minor details make each of

Kennedy, Sub.

these and many other cases of military development unique, they are linked by one major theme. That is that militarization of sparsely populated regions tends to dislocate indiginous people from their ancestral homelands and limit their ability to practice their customary way of life.

The Native Peoples' Support Group believes that low level military flight training will undermine all human use of lands regularly over-flown,and effectively alienate Innu from their land base. Moreover, since customary Innu hunting and harvesting practices require the same land base threatened by military activities, the project will further restrict these practices and could eradicate Innu culture.

In response to the Guidelines' suggestion that hypotheses be formulated and systematically tested, the Support Group puts forward the following hypothesis: Given that military development generally displaces indiginous peoples from their land and livelihood, and that customary Innu land use practices are synonymous with Innu culture military flying activities will lead to the disintegration of the Innu economy, society and culture.

The Support Group recommends that this hypothesis be included in the revised Guidelines, and that it be tested both during the study period and during the later monitoring period.

Kennedy, Sub.

Moreover, consistent with the Guidelines, that is point 6, page 12, the Support Group strongly recommends that the EIS include data on comparative examples of the impact of militarization on indigenous peoples. We are suggesting here, frankly Mr. Chairman, that what we are going to be seeing, we believe anyway, in the next few years in the Labrador and Quebec case is not new. It has happened before. And rather than reinventing the wheel here, what we are recommending is that we look at some of the evidence that exists and see whether or not whether we might benefit from that evidence. That is, evidence that exists vis-a-vis militarization on indigenous peoples.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Would you be able to provide to the Panel specific examples of sources that perhaps the Panel may not yet be aware of.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. I can give you a partial reading list on it. We have yet to develop a more complete one. It is a topic which is difficult to find material on. We have some. There has not been a great deal of research. But what exists does show what I suggest. I will be glad to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. KENNEDY: Point two, our second major point here is the scope of the Guidelines, as discussed on pages 7 and 8.

Kennedy, Sub.

The Support Group believes that the scope of the Guidelines is not sufficiently broad. In relationship to Guidelines points 3(a) and 3(b), we believe that these should be amended so that the Panel has a mandate to recommend whether both low level flights and the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre should be allowed to proceed, and if so, under what conditions.

Continued low level flights could seriously compromise, we believe, necessary biological and socio-economic base line data, and we recommend a moratorium on all military activities until the EIS is complete. We believe that present low level flights permitted under various bilateral agreements contradict the spirit of the whole FEARO process. A partial description of that process reads: "A project submitted for review cannot be carried out until a decision has been reached on the recommendations submitted to the Minister of the Environment by the Panel." That is a quote from the Government of Canada's short brief, 1979, page 5, on the FEARO process. I recognize there can be some debate about the semantics of whether or not the project has begun, but certainly to Innu who have been overflown, there is no debate. Something has started, and I would suggest here that we need a moratorium until we get all the date in and a proper decision can be made.

The third major point that I have to

Kennedy, Sub.

make is that the Support Group believes that settlement of Aboriginal land claims is the most important step towards the equitable and planned development of the north. I am very happy to hear your comments, Mr. Chairman, that you have received considerable information supporting that position, and certainly, like others, I will be looking forward to seeing whatever might appear in the revised Guidelines, vis-à-vis Aboriginal policy, land claims policy.

In this regard, we endorse the Panel's conclusion on page 14 that the project has important effects on land claims negotiations. Given the importance that the Native Peoples' Support Group attaches to settlement of Aboriginal land claims. We again recommend a moratorium on all military activities until land claims within the impact area have been settled.

I have, as I promised, a number of specific recommendations vis-à-vis the Guidelines, and I will just point to some of them because I will be immediately passing this document to you for your use. In any event, I will just bring out some of these. One of them is page 11. The Support Group would like to know what the proposed duration of the project is. That may be a difficult one to answer, I appreciate.

On page 27, the Support Group agrees, very strongly I might add, with the need for original

Kennedy, Sub.

fieldwork on subsistence economies and on the viability of cultures. However, we believe that the revised Guidelines should be much more specific on where such fieldwork will occur, on what methodologies will be employed, on the length of time of such research and so on.

We also have problems with the use of the term "viability", page 27. Are we to assume that the EIS will be making value judgements on cultural viability. If so, we want to know more about the criteria on which such judgements will be made, as well as the Panel's rationale for making them. For example, if contemporary Innu culture is found to lack the viability of that of their ancestors -- a conclusion I may add which is readily reached by many supporters of this project, including many of my friends in the room -- could this then justify expropriation of Innu lands for military uses.

The potentially insidious use of judgements about viability concern us greatly, as does the fact that many people reaching them fail to consider the recent role of the state in systematically undermining contemporary Innu culture. In short, while we support fieldwork, we recommend that the rationale for any search for viability be made more explicit.

Another of the specific points I would make regards the coastal bombing ranges, which I asked the Major a question about earlier on.

Kennedy, Sub.

This refers to page 29, I might add. The Support Group would like to see the revised EIS Guidelines give considerably more attention to the coastal -- and I accept your correction -- not bombing ranges, but sea ranges. For example, how many are planned? Where will they be located? What will they be used for, and with what level of frequency? And, how might the presence of such ranges restrict human movement along the coast? What effect might they have on coastal settlers and/or Inuit, as well as on transient Newfoundland fishermen?

The final point I would make again is a specific point, pages 34 and 35: Can we assume that measures are planned to monitor the long-term impacts of this project? If so, what kinds of monitoring will occur, and for what duration? Will we, for example, see monitoring that goes on for several decades into the future? What, if any, monitoring is presently occurring? How often, and where? We are given to believe that at present, rightly or wrongly, there is no monitoring occurring. Will the proponent assume all costs of monitoring, present, if it exists, or future? If so, what measures will be taken to insure the independent nature of monitoring studies? Will the results of such monitoring studies be made public? If so, in what form?

With those comments and questions, and again with my sincere thanks to the Panel for this

Kennedy, Sub.

opportunity to present them, and for your patience. I wish you every good luck in your deliberation of the EIS. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. And thank you for keeping your presentation as short as that, sir. It is much appreciated.

Do you want to ask a question?

MR. HAROLD HISCOCK: I would. I am Harold Hiscock of the Inter-Church Commission.

In reference to what John Kennedy was saying about the viability of cultures, I wonder, in your interpretation, getting back to what we raised, the valued ecosystem approach, would that valued ecosystem approach be able to define what a viable culture is, and then use that throughout the EIS to address that, to address what is viable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Dr. Wilkinson would like to respond to that.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: I think there is a little bit of confusion about what we were getting at in that sentence. Perhaps it is phrased badly. What we were referring to was that there is a substantial body of anthropological literature which demonstrates, in my opinion, that in the case of subsistence economies the relationship between the economy and its survival and the culture and its survival is so close and so inextricable that if you undermine or destroy the economy, you necessarily destroy the culture, which is perhaps less the case in industrial societies where we seem to have a greater ability to switch our economic bases.

What we were trying to do in this sentence was simply to guide the promoter to take account of what we see as this difference between subsistence economies and other ones. I do not think we are asking anyone to pronounce a judgement on the viability of cultures as such.

MR. HISCOCK: Okay. I will leave it, I guess.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are next scheduled to hear from the Unemployment Action Committee, Mr. Benson.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DAVID BENSON:

My name is David Benson and I am Vice-President of the Unemployment Action Committee. Unemployment Committees are sort of transitory. If we are successful in our ultimate aim, we will cease to exist. So, I guess, in some ways, we share something with the military.

Our major concern with this is there has been no information coming out on which we can base any kind of analysis. What we would like to see is an emphasis placed on the jobs to be created since this project is being touted as a job creation scheme. The classification of those jobs, current wage rates for those job classifications, the numbers involved, both short term and long term construction work, once the project has reached the point where it is on-going, and the local labour supply, will that be able to meet the needs.

Hand in hand with that, look at the layoffs of civilian workers which have already taken place and which we hear are going to continue. We hear there will be 120 more laid off pretty soon, air traffic controllers, fire fighters and so on, as the jobs are filled by military personnel. So, while we always look at these sorts of developments in terms of how many jobs they will create, we seldom look at them in terms of how many jobs they will eliminate by their existence.

I am glad to see there is something in

Benson, Sub.

there about the sea base livelihood, the Innu and Inuit. A couple of years ago the allied countries, Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, which are now coming into this NATO base, destroyed the sea base livelihood of the Inuit people by their banning of the importation of seal pelts. So, at the risk of being paranoid, one wonders if that was connected with a move to establish sea ranges on the coast of Labrador.

Major McCabe is not here now, but I understand that a large part of the financial commitment that the NATO countries are currently putting into their operations in Labrador is spent on fuel. I understand that figure is 65 per cent of their total financial commitment. I would like to be able to get some confirmation on that.

Also, some confirmation on whether or not it is true that the Luftwaffe currently sends its laundry to Germany to be cleaned, and if this will change when the economic boom hits Goose Bay.

In the Draft Guidelines it mentions chemical defoliants; for the Panel to look at these, how they would be used, and so on, to clear the bombing ranges. The Minister of Rural Agricultural Northern Development has assured me that chemical defoliants have not been used in Canada in 30 years and will not be used in Labrador. Now, either the Minister is hopelessly misinformed or he is a liar.

Benson, Sub.

This project seems to be the latest in a long line of megaprojects. We can go right back to the Trans-Newfoundland Railway up through to the Grand Falls Mill, Cornerbrook Mill, Churchill Falls, Come-by-Chance, Come-by-Chance II, or so it would seem, the offshore oil and so on. It is the latest in a line of such projects that have been used by politicians to gain and regain power on the promise of jobs.

Now, we have heard everything from 2,000 down to 500 jobs to be created, and the cost of the project varies from $800 million to over $1 billion, depending on who is talking. If we take the figure of 1,000 jobs and the cost of $1 billion, that means to create a single job you will have to spend a million bucks. I would suggest that if that was suggested for any other sector of the economy, it would be consider lunacy.

We do not know whether or not local people will be qualified to get any jobs that do take place and, given what has happened in other places where bases are built and operate, it seems these jobs will be mainly in the service sector. Yet, this whole scheme is being propagated as an economic development to create jobs and it is only when that myth is blown away that the peace and freedom and goodness and niceness and democracy and freedom and so on, that kind of rhetoric comes to the fore. Here

Benson, Sub.

too, they cannot seem to get their story straight because, if the base is to defend us against the big bad wolf or the Commie hordes who are going to be pouring in from the North Pole or wherever, why are the aircraft involved, not interceptors but strike aircraft, the Tornado, the F-4 Phantom and so on, and the Tornado GR-1 which is the strike version of that aircraft?

If we are practicing defence, why use Labrador and Quebec for this terrain that resembles that of the Soviet Union? We are tempted to wonder just how far forward you mean by forward defence.

Does Turkey, which is the rival for Goose Bay for this base, have a terrain that resembles the Soviet Union? I do not think so.

What is the training all about? I think we saw the answer in the American raid on Libya several months ago. I would suggest that in this week, in particular with the 30th anniversary of the Russian destruction of the Hungarian Revolution, and the Western powers standing by and letting them do it, I think they should not talk too much about freedom and democracy and so on.

The story keeps changing. One time we are told that there is to be no explosive used, no live ordinance, just cold smoke bombs. Now we are told, at fairly high levels, that there will be all manner of ordinance used. I think Mr. Armitage

Benson, Sub.

alluded to that. We were told it will be in the interior, and now we are told there may be a sea range as well. They cannot seem to make up their minds, possibly because they do not know or they are making it up as they go along. But we are not really sure. We just do not have the information.

It is obvious that people in West Germany and Britain do not want low level flights. Various members of the West German parliament have talked about putting the situation over in Labrador because the territory is uninhabited. We recall, many years ago, hearing that argument many years ago with regard to Palestine, and we understand that there were a few minor difficulties which arose because of that.

This project will not come under any kind of control whatsoever from the local people. They will have no input into how it is managed, how it is set up, the duration of it, or any kind of impact it will have. It will be one more development completely controlled from the outside.

We see the deepening crisis in the economy and the resulting increased emphasis on the military and military-related industries, research and development, technological innovations, new and ever increasing outlays of capital and state run infrastructure having directed toward exclusive use by the military. That is not unexpected, given

Benson, Sub.

that the government seems to be the only person who can afford to buy a lot of the expensive gadgetry that is coming out.

We do not think it is a very healthy or a very stable way to go in our economy, since the means and the end are both basically anti-people; whether they are anti-people that we do not like at this particular time, or just anti-people in general, particularly people affected on the ground.

Given the nature of super power politics these days, that it is more a case of both of them cooperating with each other --as I mentioned Hungary or Biafra as an extreme example -- to shut down any kind of move geared to get clear of both of them.

We think that this training will be used against the Third World, and particularly Labrador, which has a lot more in common with them than with the industrialized superpowers. Given all that, we look upon the Panel as a public relations exercise. The decision is supposed to be made this December. There are decisions being made all the time. This Panel cannot question Canada's defence policy, and whether or not the military increases its presence in Goose Bay under the name of a Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre or just a whole bunch of new bilateral agreements, it does not really matter in relation to

Benson, Sub.

what will happen on the ground.

We cannot really take the Panel seriously despite the obviously eminent qualifications of the Panel members, and we would like to take this opportunity to inform everybody that we are getting quite tired of being treated like mushrooms.

Major McCabe, there are a couple of points I made when you were out there. I was wondering if you could give me some kind of break-down on what the cost is of present commitments that NATO countries have that are operating in Goose Bay now. What percentage of their commitment is spent on fuel? Is there any way you know what?

MAJOR McCABE: I have heard figures used, and I do not want to use them myself because I am not exactly sure of them. There are representatives here from the local community who, I think, could possibly answer that better than I. So, I would not want to give you any figures there.

MR. BENSON: We have heard reports that the Luftwaffe sends its laundry to Germany to be cleaned -- I would not say it takes its laundry out every day, but periodically -- do you know if that is true?

MAJOR McCABE: I have not the remotest idea, really. I am sorry. Once again, possibly someone from the local area could give you an answer on this.

MR. BENSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the end of your presentation?

MR. BENSON: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: In that case, thank you very much.

One more thing, sir. If you happen to have anything in writing that you could present to the Panel, that would be appreciated. If not immediately, then at least by the end of October. Thank you very much.

Next we will hear from the St. John's Ploughshares organization. I believe we are to have two speakers from that group. If you are ready, would you please come forward.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WALTER DAVIS:

MR. DAVIS: My name is Walter Davis. I am Chairperson of St. John's Ploughshares. The youth group is quite separate. We asked them to do their own thing. We encourage them to speak their own way and express their own views. So, in reality, while they are sponsored by Ploughshares' senior group, they have an independency of their own. So, I would appreciate it if you would give them time of their own, Mr. Chairman.

May I, first of all, take a little exception to my good friend David Benson, who I

Davis, Sub.

regard as a scholar of the first order, and I would not wish to pit my little brain with his for one moment. But when he says that he questions your sincerity, more or less, I have to disagree.

I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, you have got in the Chairman of this Committee one of the fairest-minded people I have ever known, and probably one of the fairest minds anywhere. And I compliment the Commission for having selected you, sir, to head this Panel. I know your report will be fair.

As for your record of service to Newfoundland -- which was pretty much ahead of the environmental program you pioneered here, you also pioneered largely in the fight against cigarette smoking, which is a bit of a nuisance to humanity as well. So I compliment you as an old friend, and one who respects you very highly. I have to say, quite emphatically, that I think you are quite sincere in hearing the various respective views.

Mr. Chairman, you asked for notes. I prepared my notes just a few moments ago, so I do not have a prepared submission, but speaking for Ploughshares, we agreed at our last meeting that I would be the spokesman, and to support generally the position that we do not want any increase at all in low flying in Labrador for the various reasons which I think have already been enunciated very clearly

Davis, Sub.

by the various experts.

If I may, sir, say that I have had some concern for some years within the environment generally, and this might help to provide focus. As you know, in 1972, I had the good fortune of heading the Stockholm Conference in Stockholm which was the first conference ever held on the environment, and I happened to head the non-governmental organizations throughout the world, an honour that was very distinct to me and to Canada. I represented some one million Rotarians at the time, as their representative. As a consequence of that representation I was chosen as the World Chairman of the NGO's at the Stockholm Conference convened by the United Nations.

That conference succeeded in changing the attitude of humanity towards the environment. It was the first time in the history of our civilization that it was recognized that the environment is in jeopardy, our world environment. The environment of Canada is in jeopardy. I am afraid the recent developments tend to emphasize that.

It is in that regard, really, that any increase in military flying in Labrador might be a tendancy in that direction.

I am here today as a spokesman, really, for three or four groups which I am affiliated with. One is the St. John's Ploughshares, of which I am Chairman. We also have a newly established U.N.

Davis, Sub.

Association in St. John's known as the St. John's Branch of the U.N. Association. I am speaking for them too when we say we condemn any increase in militarization anywhere in the world, and this is why we are opposing an increase in the NATO base which could bring more low flying in Labrador. We are as much against it in Turkey as anywhere. The United Nations stands firmly against armaments, stands firmly on the side of disarmament. Last week's parade which unfortunately in St. John's was incorrectly reported in the Telegram tonight as being at 200 people. To the best of our knowledge, there were over 1,000 people brought out. I would just like to correct that. All that was brought out to emphasize that disarmament has a total program, which is what we need.

Also, I would like to say that a larger group wants to record its objection here today, and that is the National Survival Institute, with its head office in Ottawa.

The National Survival Institute is perhaps the strongest voice in Canada today on environmental matters. It was formed for that purpose after we returned from Stockholm, and I would like to mention the fact that Vern Kneeslip was the principal founder with myself, and Everett Briggs who was then the Deputy Minister of Ontario, we drafted the first environmental act which became a

Davis, Sub.

a model for Canada. So I think we can speak with some concern, if not with expertise on this issue today.

On behalf of the National Survival Institute, we also condemn outright any threats to our environment, any increase in militarization which is, in my opinion, the chief threat to civilization on earth today.

I would like to speak about, and I cannot speak about it without emotion or passion, and I will say I have just arrived here this afternoon, having spoken to some one hundred children, all under 16 years of age, all concerned about their environment, their future, and what we are doing for them.

Allow me to say this: They are defenceless. They know the militarization of this Earth is not in their best interests, and what we are doing in Labrador is just in that direction. They know there is no hope unless we make a complete turn around. They could hardly speak, so do you know what they did? All hundred students, all under 16 years of age went down to the Grotto in Labrador in Flat Rock at 2:00 o'clock this afternoon, and knelt in prayer with Pope John in Assisi, as he knelt and fasted today. What for? For the protection of our Mother Earth, our planet, to stop the mad race towards the nuclear holocaust. It is all in the same package.

So we respectfully call on you, sir,

Davis, Sub.

today to try and make a turn around, even in our little Canada. Cannot we make the Goose airport a world monitoring centre for peace, for disarmament, for the elimination of all nuclear weapons? Cannot we get the Soviets and the American to come there, and the Canadians, and convert Goose not into a military area, but to turn it around? This would please the Natives and it would please all humanity. It would please everybody. If we could do just one great thing in Canada: Make Goose a world centre for monitoring peace.

That is all I have to say, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Thank you also for your complimentary remarks, and your expression of confidence in the Panel.

As Mr. Davis indicated, we will now hear a presentation from the Children's Crusade for Peace. Is that right, Mr. Davis?

Excuse me, the Ploughshares Group.

---SUBMISSION BY PLOUGHSHARES YOUTH:

First of all, I would like to thank the Panel for giving us a chance to express our concern, and I might say this is our first time addressing a panel like this, so please bear with us.

We are Ploughshares Youth. As youth in Newfoundland we feel we have a voice and a definite statement to make regarding the militarization of Labrador and Quebec.

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

We do not make any pretence as to having all the answers. Our motto is education through action to evoke a public awareness of the dangers of the escalating arms race amongst other global issues.

The more we educate ourselves on this issue of the establishment of a NATO base in Labrador, the more we perceive it as a stabilizing factor in east-west relations.

In our studies in school we have learned that NATO is an alliance of countries united to become a stabilizing force in east-west relations. Seeing as the Tornado aircraft are nuclear capable, we believe that in the event of an east-west border conflict, the Tornado aircraft could easily be mistaken as carrying nuclear warheads.

A radar screen cannot distinguish exactly what type of warhead a missile or plane is carrying, so we do not see how this type of activity is in any way stabilizing to the already precarious situation in east-west relations.

We, as young people, also resent the fact that the government's answer to Newfoundland's high poverty and unemployment rate is to militarize the economy. As a person about to enter the job force, I feel that it is wrong that the only viable occupational area to enter is the military. I feel that I would have to compromise my morals and

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

prostitute myself to become employed and dependent on the madness of the arms race.

As my friends have already before mentioned, we are not here today to try and present and verify a lot of facts, or make any profound statements regarding the opinions of our group. On the contrary, we are here to express our concerns regarding this issue of the military manoeuvres and base in Labrador.

We see a great deal of apparent contradiction between what we hear from various media sources surrounding us each day.

A primary issue which evokes this concern is the concept that this base will have a stabilizing effect on Labrador in terms of job creation and the economy. We raised several questions with regard to this claim.

We are led to believe that military expenditures will somehow revitalize or stimulate the economy, creating many new jobs. Some jobs will be created, that is inevitable. But the nature of these jobs and the stability of this new, improved condition of employment is a cause of concern for us.

What kinds of jobs will be created? We are interested to know. We are concerned that firstly, the types of jobs created would not be in areas of occupation where the unemployment rate is

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

highest, and therefore do little to alleviate the overall problem in our province. Perhaps they will require more technically skilled workers than civilians, where the unemployment problem is indeed the greatest.

Would Labradorians even land these new jobs? Some of them might go to international bidders. Would not more jobs be created, we think, within this civilian sector in projects having to do with public works such as academic institutions or recreational centres.

We are concerned that the economy would become somewhat dependent on the military, with little diversity in economics and employment.

Even if many jobs are indeed created, we are concerned that history may repeat itself; that perhaps after Labrador's economy has become dependent, to some degree, upon the base and occupations connected with the military, that the system could collapse when the military withdraws, and the base becomes obsolete.

As we are all aware, in 1976, when the U.S. felt the need was reduced to maintain the Goose Air Base they had established there, the economic dependence which had been formed surrounding it was drastically felt. The population fell and the unemployment rate skyrocketed. We are very concerned that this could reoccur.

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

As youth about to enter the job market, as Rick has already said, we wish to convey our very deep reservations about perhaps having to look at an available assortment of jobs connected primarily with the military. We have very strong moral judgments opposing the activities connected with these jobs.

We wish to find answers to these questions, which is our primary reason for making an appearance here today, among many others so we can find some peace of mind individually regarding our future, and that of our province.

The emphasis has always been on job creation neglecting other factors such as the health and environmental issues. We are concerned about the fact that we cannot find answers to various questions such as the effects of sonic booms, the low level jet noise and the chemical contamination from jet fumes. Will this have an effect on hearing and create psychological stress? What will it do to the environment and wildlife? Government does not seem concerned about it since they are inviting in military activities before studies are complete.

We need answers now before final decisions about the military measures are given.

As my friends have already mentioned, there are many questions the people of Newfoundland and Labrador need answered. How would a base in Labrador affect the environment, health, Native rights,

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

east-west relations and job creation?

We feel that a military base would create a community economically dependent on the military industry.

I, with many other youth, do not want to have to sacrifice my morals when my time comes to find employment. I do not want to be forced to work in an industry that would be, in actual fact, supporting nuclear war. We do not want to be part of any war game.

We would like to be fully aware of the pros and cons of such a NATO base in Labrador. Only then can we and other people form opinions.

We do not like to tell people what to think. Peace groups are often slandered, and, contrary to popular belief we are not a bunch of radical trouble makers. We are concerned, and often confused. I am sure you people would be able to out-fact us any time, and the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training base may be your business, but peace is everybody's business.

Although I have not mentioned any specific sections of the Guidelines, we have discovered that there is no medium that young people of Newfoundland and Labrador may use to voice their concerns. We feel that this type of meeting, with highly structured and formal procedures in no way encourages young people to voice any concerns they

Ploughshares Youth, Sub.

may have. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I apologize for the momentary confusion there a moment ago. For the record, that was a presentation by Ploughshares Youth. Is that correct? Good.

You should not be concerned about the quality of your presentation. I can assure you that the preparation and delivery of that was just as good as a great many of the other presentations we have received at previous meetings. Thank you again.

Next on my list of presentations I have listed the Childrens' Crusade for Peace. Is there a spokesman here for that group?

I see Mr. Davis approaching the table again. Perhaps you can clear up the ...

MR. WALTER DAVIS: I have already spoken, but since you have given me the time, I will add just a few technical comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps five minutes, sir.

MR. DAVIS: Five minutes will be just fine.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WALTER DAVIS:

MR. DAVIS: I refer to something you know more about than I do, and that is carbon monoxide poisoning, which is a possibility of being emitted to a greater extent with low flying.

Now let me say this: Carbon monoxide is an odourless and colourless gas, which is produced mainly by internal combustion engines. High intact of carbon monoxide impairs perception and psycho-motor performance. The greater the distance from the source, whether it is vertical or horizontal, the smaller the CO readings.

When planes fly low and close to the ground, the higher the amount of CO, carbon monoxide, that individuals will breathe. It is also a known fact that children breathe in larger amount of carbon monoxide than do their parents. Higher amounts of carbon monoxide occur when air traffic density increases. Carbon monoxide readings are, of course, lower in high winds than when there is no wind at all.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we should avoid, on health grounds alone before we know more about the extent of the injury, mainly to Native people. We are going to have some emission, but this is totally unnecessary. This increase in low level flying and increasing the pollution of the atmosphere for military purposes is completely unnecessary.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you again, Mr. Davis.

The time is approaching the scheduled end of this afternoon's session, but the Panel has decided to continue on until 5:30 to help accommodate the large number of speakers who have registered. So we will continue on with the next scheduled speaker on the list. That is Mr. Ian Strachan, speaking on behalf of the Mokami Project Group from the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. IAN STRACHAN:

MR. STRACHAN: My name is Ian Strachan. I am talking on behalf of the Mokami Project Group. I am a member of the group by virtue of being the President of the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce.

A little bit of my background may suffice to give you indication of where I come from.

I went to Labrador initially to do work on Arctic char. I was instrumental in the building of the fish plant in Nain. I resided in Nain for nine years. I was instrumental in the formation of the Inuktituk newspaper. I also worked for the Labrador Inuit Association in the early formation years of the Labrador Inuit Association, and in starting off the land claims study.

I came south to Goose Bay and to the softer climate of Goose Bay a number of years ago. I am in business. We make no money whatsoever, no revenues from the military in Goose Bay.

I am presently involved in wood, the lumber and pulpwood industry in Goose Bay, which we started off employing up to 75 people.

Our presentation is in support of the use of Goose Bay as a military airport. Our

Strachan, Sub.

presentation has been given to you before.

I will quickly skip over the first segment and go on to the second part, which is some new material we put together.

Our principal points of concern are ones which we picked from your draft, and which we would like to bring to your attention.

It is very pleasing to the Mokami Project Group that the Guidelines apply to the entire project right up to the termination and demobilization, because too often the effects of the shutdown of a project can be socially and environmentally more traumatic than any other phase. Labrador has already experienced this trauma several times over with the pullout of the Americans in 1976, the Labrador Linerboard collapse in 1977 and the Iron Ore downsizing in 1982.

The unplanned shutdown or downsizing tends to have a greater impact on people who have not been prepared, or have not prepared themselves for such an eventuality. To have established a plan for termination of demobilization would greatly ease the hardships, but such a plan would have to include the civilian work force, and this has never been done before, as well as the military on the social guidelines of this plan.

On page 27, your second paragraph, we again want to reiterate our statement here on the

Strachan, Sub.

description of the environment must include a survey of the aspirations of the Native and non-Native residents. We would like this more fully explained; a clearly defined statement on who are Native and who are non-Native, as it relates to the study. It should be noted that the terms Native and non-Native can be quite easily distinguished in metropolitan areas such as Montreal and St. John's. It is not as easily done in Labrador.

The Inuit are native Labradorians resident mostly along the north coast. The Innu are native Labradorians resident primarily in two communities: Davis Inlet with Naskapi, and Sheshatshit with Montagnais. The Métis, or Settlers, fourth to seventh generation Natives, offspring of the marriages between the white settlers and the Innu/Inuit, are resident throughout Labrador.

The other natives are sons and daughters of people who have come to Labrador over the past 40 years, and driven their roots deep into Labrador's communities and have given to their children the proud heritage of being Labradorians.

All these people are Native, and would be highly insulted should anyone openly suggest otherwise.

The non-Natives to us are the transients, the military, the short-term construction people, som

Strachan, Sub.

government officials, some school teachers, some businessmen and most protesters against development in Labrador of any kind.

On page 22, under "infrastructure", the numbers and types of personnel distinguishing between military and civilian personnel required to operate, service and maintain the base. To extend this further, it should be required that the personne identified as essential to the operations, service and maintenance of the base should be categorized in such a way that jobs currently being held by the military, are likely to be held by the military, but are capable of being done by civilians, are identifie as such and given civilian preference to the highest possible level and the greatest possible numbers.

This would encourage people to commit themselves and their resources to increased training and advanced education with the added assurance that these types of opportunities will exist.

List are four points that we, the Mokami Project Group, strongly support: One, is the full utilization of Goose Airport. The utilizatio of existing and planned facilities at Goose Airport backed by a ten-year plan which is the life of the Memorandum of Understanding presently signed with foreign nations, setting forth the proposal for the co-existence of military aircraft, its accommodation, servicing and use in conjunction with civilian

Strachan, Sub.

operators of a local, regional and national character.

Point number two, the civilian job protection at Goose Airport: The protection of existing civilian job requirements and categories at Goose Airport; not so much the protection of the individuals, but the protection and stabilization of the jobs themselves can show that a net loss of civilian personnel does not occur to the detriment of the local economy.

Point number three, the civilian job creation at Goose Airport: Indications of the numbers, types and qualifications of the jobs to be created to ensure that other agencies and concerned groups can have sufficient lead time to promote, develop and train local residents to qualify for the anticipated growth and contribute to the stabilization of the local economy.

Point number four, a full disclosure on the details of Goose Airport proposals: The full disclosure plan for Goose Airport as it relates to planned, projected and potential growth. This will enable agencies, such as provincial government departments, local municipal councils and other planning groups the opportunity to develop along with Goose Airport in an organized manner. This will avoid delays in providing essential services and facilities that will undoubtedly be needed.

One item, item number four, we have some

Strachan, Sub.

concern for the fuel transport into Lake Melville, and along the coast, and this has been expressed previously. It is interesting to note that if we were successful in attracting the whole scope of training that we envision, it would still amount to only about one-half of what we had here in the sixties, and such things as fuel, weaponry and supplies in much larger quantities have been going through Labrador's transportation lanes for 30 years.

One aspect of transportation, however, immediately that needs to be studies is the docking in Terrington Basin. This area should be adequate to handle freight coming into Goose Bay or being shipped out, with a separate and isolated facility for the docking of tankers.

If I can take a moment of your time, we have a situation at present in Goose Bay where half the public dock in Goose Bay is utilized by large tankers discharging Jet B and Jet E cargo, while at the other end of the wharf, a coastal freighter can be discharging dynamite or forklifts and containers can pass back and forth in front of the discharging tankers. We feel that the tanker discharging facility should be an isolated facility as it was prior to the American pullout. The use at present is a dangerous use, an environmentally serious use, and accidents can very easily happen. The boat discharges its passengers only about 50 feet away from an unloading tanker.

Strachan, Sub.

Another aspect of servicing that we feel would require upgrading is the waste disposal facilities. The capacity to handle all liquid and solid wastes as it relates to the project, but not just in terms of oils, sludge or garbage, but the treatment of the sewage from the area. Presently there is no treatment process. With the increased flow and its effects on the river, the Churchill River, will bear close scrutiny.

The studies of facilities and infrastructure should show the requirements of the regional population, not just the military. The capacity of hospitals, schools and recreational facilities should be identified along with a definite plan as to locations and accessibility to all residents of the area.

One of the Mokami Project Group's biggest concerns is that Happy Valley-Goose Bay remain an integrated and vibrant community. We will not tolerate ghettoization. We have worked for the last ten years to integrate the community. The community has become more integrated since the pullout of the Americans in 1976. We would not want to see an increase in military presence there increasing a separation of the two communities and a ghettoization of the two communities.

In closing, we would like to ask the Panel to examine some facts as we see them.

Strachan, Sub.

The Innu population of what we all know as Labrador is around 850, and not many time this number as has often been presented to both the Panel and the media. The Mokami Project Group recognizes that although numerically those of the Innu who protest low level flying are in an extreme minority position, they do have serious concerns which must be addressed, concerns which we believe are greater than the issue of the presence of the military in Goose Bay. Specifically, a just and fair settlement of their land claims issues. We urge that the Panel convey to both levels of government all our deep desires that the process of negotiation and just settlement be implemented. We note the province's position today in which they indicate quite clearly that the settlement of land claims is outside the scope of the Panel. We firmly believe that, in Goose Bay, the issue is not low level flying with the Innu. The issue is land claims settlement, and it would have made no difference whether we were discussing pulp mills, aluminum smelters or a development of the Gull Island Project.

Despite many statements, again in the media, that low level flying is causing a decimation of the caribou herds, exactly the opposite has occurred to the herd population during the period 1979 to 1986. Figures given by survey biologists show a dramatic increase in the caribou population

Strachan, Sub.

from 300,000 animals in 1979 to almost 800,000 in 1986.

Since the feed range has not significantly changed, nor the wolf population decreased during that time, it could be said with tongue in cheek that a relationship could exist between increased low level flying activity and an increased caribou herd. Certainly population numbers alone do not support the wild charges of massive decimation of the herd. We would welcome an exhaustive study and constant monitoring of this important aspect.

Again, we have heard many charges, again mostly through the media, that hearing losses occur during low level flying. It is interesting from our local point of view, because it is heard on the radio every morning. It is interesting to note that this subject has lost its media appeal after a panel of medical experts, which was set up to examine the complaints, gave evidence that ear drum puncture, as was alleged to have occurred, was physically impossible, and the panel could find no one to come forward to be tested.

We give these examples in the full knowledge that it is up to all of us who support the use of certain areas of Labrador for the purpose of flying training, to put into place a mechanism for an exhaustive study of all aspects. That is presumably why we are all here. However, while charges, mostly

Strachan, Sub.

from afar, with little substantive evidence, and designed with mostly the media in mind, must not be allowed to go unchallenged. That is the purpose of our project group.

Similarly, we are not here to be utilized by the military, nor do we on a number of issues agree with them. However, we trust that a process of negotiation with endure, and that all the aspirations of all those who live and work in Labrador will be achieved.

Thank you for your time.

I have with me here Mr. John Hickey of the Mokami Regional Development Association. If we have any minutes left, he would like to utilize the balance of the time.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JOHN HICKEY:

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am appalled at some of the comments that I have heard here today, Mr. Chairman, especially from the peace movement.

I am a Labradorian. I chose to live in Labrador. I have made it my home, and I wish to raise my family there. Sometimes I get very annoyed when I see the Mr. Bensons, Mr. Armitages come forward and ask about the laundry of the German Air Force.

I would like to remind those people in the peace movement here today that Goose Bay would never have been started, only for the military.

Hickey, Sub.

Many young people, including myself, were educated in Goose Bay. Our fathers and grandfathers earned their living from the base, and we do not wish to be starved out by the peace movement. We feel that we can judge our own destiny, thank you very much.

You do not wish to live there. We do. We have no problems with the Innu. We have lived with them for hundreds of years, and I am appalled to see the peace movement use the Innu people, in my opinion, to further their own goals.

We look around the world and we see Gadafi, and we see the Nicaraguans, and we see the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. We feel Labrador can contribute to the defence of Canada and to the defence of democracy, and that is what most Labradorians feel. Every cooperative council in Labrador has supported this base. We do not wish to be starved out by CFA's and outsiders.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

MS SUSAN SHINER: My name is Susan Shiner. I am a member of NAPO, the North Atlantic Peace Organization. I came here to listen to proceedings today. I have nothing prepared, but I have to answer one claim. I think that the development in Labrador that we are discussing today affects every person on the face of this earth.

I feel very strongly that because I do not live in Labrador I do not have anything to say, in some peoples' opinions. I was sitting back there listening to the charges against peace groups furthering their own aims. I got involved in the project against the militarization of Labrador because I have been involved in disarmament activities for many years and all of a sudden it was here within my country, within my province. No longer could I put my energies into talking about worldwide trends, about American policies, about European policies, about the Warsaw Pact, about the Soviet Union. I was talking about a development that was happening right here. I have a right to speak out, as every other person who speaks from the peace perspective has a right to speak out. Not to starve anyone, only because we want to see the resources of our planet and our country used for peaceful means. We want to see people have jobs that contribute to their future and the future of their children. We do not want to see anyone forced to work for a group who may spell the end of our children's future. My daughter's future I am not sure of because of the state of the world right now, because of that confrontational attitude that looks around the world and sees enemies everywhere. We need to find other ways and we need to be able to speak out at hearings like this and wherever we can. If we feel moved, then we should speak.

We should not speak in fear of someone telling us that we have no right to speak, especially people who talk about democracy when it suits them. This is why we have to keep speaking. Not because we live there or do not live there, but because we care about what is happening in our country and on our planet.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Our final speaker, I believe, for this afternoon session will be Mr. Dennis MacKay, speaking on behalf of the Social Responsibilities group.

MR. DENNIS MACKAY: Members of the Panel, perhaps I should make a correction there. It is Lawyers for Social Responsibility. I am a practicing lawyer here in St. John's and I speak on behalf of that group.

A preliminary comment. While I have the greatest confidence in you, Mr. Chairman, and members of your Panel, I would, for the record, like to state that it is rather unfortunate, in my opinion, that there are no female members of your Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, could I respond to that?

MR. MACKAY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry for the interruption, but this Panel did, in fact, have one female member. Unfortunately she has found it necessary to resign from the Panel a few weeks ago and we are presently seeking a replacement.

MR. MACKAY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps that is the danger of having only one female member.

THE CHAIRMAN: Point noted, sir. Please go ahead.

---SUBMISSION BY DENNIS MACKAY:

MR. MACKAY: I will be very brief. I know the time grows late. I think that my concerns will be, while we consider them important, relatively narrow in their scope.

Lawyers for Social Responsibility is an incorporated body set up in 1984 by Canadian lawyers to promote peace in the global village using the special skills and training that lawyers have. We feel our primary task is to educate the legal profession, teachers, policy-makers and the general public, to the dangers and problems of war and the roots of global tensions.

With regard to my presentation today, let me first state that, in general, Lawyers for Social Responsibility believe that the Draft Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement are

MacKay, Sub.

comprehensive but somewhat limited in scope, at least according to our interpretation. Perhaps they may be interpreted very broadly but, on our initial reading, this is our feeling.

Specifically, on our reading of the Guidelines, there is no clear statement of the necessity for the proponents to answer or even consider the potential effect of increased militarization will or may have on civil liberties, specifically, and legal relationships in the area of the militarization generally. While we do not come here today with any kind of research material which we feel answer or support the kinds of questions being presented today, we do feel that the failure to consider the issues outlined here will leave a gap, albeit perhaps a small one, in the discussions and affect the conclusions reached or any recommendations made.

That being our general concern, we would ask that the following questions be included in an appropriate manner within the Guidelines of your study.

Firstly, what are the potential consequences of increased military activity upon the civil liberties presently enjoyed by persons living in Goose Bay and the Labrador area; and what would be the manner in which claims made by civilians against the military in the Goose Bay-Labrador area be adjudicated. In way of support for the above questions

MacKay, Sub.

being included, we would make the following submissions.

It is submitted that increased militarization will have a detrimental effect upon the present freedom of movement enjoyed by citizens of Labrador. We submit that this will result from the increased security requirements necessary because of the increases in the number of countries hosted and the degree of sophistication of technology present at the base. The possible results of this, we submit, are increased searches of persons and property, military roadblocks and other hindrances to mobility in the area, increased general surveillance of the population, and outright restrictions on areas open to travel by the civilian population.

It is submitted that increased militarization will result in greater contact between military police forces which, whether Canadian or foreign, may not have the same traditions and guidelines relating to arrest and search and seizure as non-military police. We would submit this could result in a decreased role of the Charter of Rights in areas of contact between police and general population.

It is submitted that increased militarization may result in the necessity for increased privacy invasion determining appropriate candidates for employment, activity not normally part of the application process for non-military civilian

MacKay, Sub.

employment. This could result, it is submitted, in intensive searches into personal backgrounds of the potential employees and, secondly, potential ethnic and national discrimination in job placement.

It is submitted that, generally, increased security requirements will be used to justify anything but strict adherence to the rights guaranteed in the Charter. Most significantly, those rights relating to protection against unreasonable search and seizure, the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned, rights pertaining to arrest procedures and the right to a fair and public hearing. The justification, again, as already suggested, will be based upon the increased security requirements of the base.

Secondly, and a much more general concern, Lawyers for Social Responsibility would ask that the proponent respond to the following area of concern. In the event that there are civilian claims for damages to property or possessions or possible personal injury claims, will there be any restrictions placed upon the rights to sue in court because, for example, of security reasons.

We would also make the following inquiries which we would ask to be addressed. That relates to the nature of the agreement that would be in place. We would ask, first of all, would this agreement between the host country, Canada, and the

MacKay, Sub.

other countries involved in the military activity, be a written agreement that would be available to the public? Specifically, what are the review mechanisms with regard to this agreement? Again, will there be any civilian community or civilian input into the review process? Finally, what would be the mechanism on which this agreement could be terminated?

The final comment, which I mentioned, how would the agreement be terminated, will perhaps become clear when we submit that the relationship between the deep strike technology and nuclear war technology itself may be so close that the activity at the base could very well have breached international treaties which may be part of Canadian law. Therefore, we ask, what would be the -- we would ask to know under what conditions the agreement could be terminated?

For example, if it was found that certain activity was in breach of Canadian law, would the agreement automatically be terminated or what would be the process or could the Court order it be terminated, what would be the process by which it would be terminated?

Finally, while it is not a part of our submission, Lawyers for Social Responsibility wish to express their concerns about the issue of Aboriginal rights, specifically the land claims issue.

Thank you, Members of the Panel, for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. MacKay.

It is now nearly 5:20. We did have another speaker scheduled for this afternoon. I wonder if I could ask that speaker, Mr. Thompson, whether his presentation is going to be a lengthy one or whether it could be completed within perhaps 10 or 15 minutes?

Is Mr. David Thompson present here? It appears not. What I am attempting to do here is to get a head start on tonight's session.

The first speaker scheduled for tonight is Mr. Tony Williamson. Is Mr. Williamson here and, if so, could he give us some indication of how long his presentation might be? Ten minutes.

In that case, I would ask you to come forward now, if you are prepared to do so and if it is not inconvenient, and make your presentation to the Panel.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. TONY WILLIAMSON:

MR. WILLIAMSON:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Panel, thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before you and to present my views on the Draft Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec.

I am appearing before you as an independent expert. As such, as I am not representing any interest or group, nor is it my purpose at this

Williamson, Sub.

session to make a statement for or against the project.

My name is Tony Williamson, I have lived in Labrador for 15 years. I have been involved over 25 years in environmental assessments and socio-economic studies in Labrador, the Northwest Territories, Alaska and Greenland. My resume is placed with the FEARO office if you want details on my experience and knowledge concerning Labrador.

I congratulate the Panel on the detail and excellence of the Draft Guidelines. In 25 years of involvement with environmental assessments, it is one of the best guidelines I have ever seen. It will be a major accomplishment for the proponent to fulfill the Guidelines prepared by this Panel and in the time frame set by this Panel.

Mr. Chairman, there are only a few observations and suggestions I should like to make in the hopes of assisting in the execution of an environmental assessment which is resonsive to the legitimate concerns of the people of Labrador and Quebec.

Number one has to do with the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. I note that the project is subject to the federal impact assessment process of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, as well as the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, and that the Panel will therefore give due consideration to the guiding principles stated in Section 24.2.2 and

Williamson, Sub.

23.2.4 of the JBNQA in its review.

Section c) of 23.2.2 gives, and I quote:

"Special status and involvement for the Native people and other inhabitants of the Region over and above that provided for in procedures involving the general public through consultation or representative mechanisms wherever such is necessary to protect or give effect to the rights and guarantees in favour of the Native people established by and in accordance with the Agreement."

Because special protection is carefully spelled out for the Natives of Northern Quebec in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, there is a danger that negative impacts of the military activities under review could be deflected to the Labrador and St. Lawrence North Shore sectors of the peninsula, where the Native people were not included nor given the opportunity to be party to the JBNQA. In the interests of justice and equality, I would urge that the Guidelines state explicitly that all parties, Native or non-Native, will be given the same status under the principles of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, so that there will be no temptation to concentrate military activities with potential negative impacts in those areas not under the protection of the JBNQA.

The second point I would like to raise

Williamson, Sub.

has to do with data collection and monitoring. The data required for assessment under these Draft Guidelines will, in many instances, simply not be available. For example, there is very little data available on small mammals and avi-fauna on the Labrador/Ungava Peninsula. Such data, to be meaningful, takes years to collect, requiring repeated field work over several life cycles. Obviously, such data cannot be gathered within the time frame of the environmental assessment. In fact, one of the major weaknesses of environmental assessments is the time constraints imposed in the face of critical gaps in basic knowledge and data, especially in frontier areas like Quebec and Labrador.

All too often, extrapolations are made on the basis of the scantiest of information. This is compounded when synergistic consequences of accumulative multiplicity of activities must be assessed for a given environment. For these reasons I believe that it is important that the Guidelines recognize the need for data gathering beyond the time frame of the assessment. It can do this by clearly building it into the monitoring process, in which the proponent is required to continue the collection of basic data crucial to the measurement of impacts from the project.

In order for the public to evaluate the assessment of impacts in the environmental review, I believe it is also important for the review to clearly

Williamson, Sub.

state the amount and reliability of data from which the assessments are made. I believe you have covered that to some degree in your Guidelines.

Although monitoring is called for in the Draft Guidelines, there does not appear to be any specific reference or enough reference to means which will ensure that monitoring, mitigation or compensation are adhered to by the proponent once the project is under way. Large scale projects have a way of developing a life of their own with little or no means for the public to know or ensure that the conditions imposed by the assessment are being adhered to or even that the project is proceeding according to the description in the assessment process. This would be so for military activity in which the proponent can deny to the public information about the project for purposes of national security.

Therefore, it is particularly important, in the project under review by this Panel, that the Guidelines indicate as clearly as possible not only what monitoring, mitigation and compensation must take place but in what manner these requirements will be enforced and in what manner the public will be consulted or kept informed regarding changes in the project or negative impacts which may have occurred.

The third point has to do with past military activity in Labrador. In the Draft Guidelines, the Panel includes an assessment of low level military

Williamson, Sub.

flying beginning with 1980. Low level military flying has in fact been going in Labrador and northern Quebec since the 1960s and military activity, in general, has taken place out of Goose Bay ever since the end of World War II. There has also been the impact of the Pine Tree Line and Mid-Canada Radar Lines in the 1950s and 1960s.

Undoubtedly, there has been some valuable data collected and assessed over this period of time illustrating both positive and negative impacts on the social, cultural, economic and natural environments of Labrador, which can provide lessons in an assessment of proposed or expanded military activities for the 1980s and 1990s. I suggest that the Panel not limit the assessment to 1980 but include in the Guidelines an assessment of available information on military activities beginning with the 1940s through to the present.

Fourthly, and finally, the matter of human rights. I am happy to see that the Panel has identified as an important issue the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims, even though the Panel has no mandate to deal with the subject of land claims policy.

Because there is considerable misunderstanding concerning the use of the words "land claims", I believe the Panel could reinforce its concern for this issue by explicitly recognizing that

Williamson, Sub.

Native land claims negotiations are really not about real estate but about basic human rights that the dominant society of Canada takes for granted, such as rights to self-determination as a people, ownership of land and resources, rights of language, religion and cultural expression. These are built into the Charter of Rights and Canada's Constitution and they are also declared in the universal declaration of human rights promulgated by the United Nations. Whether the specific rights of Canada's Native people are determined by constitutional debate or a land claims policy, care must be taken that the outcome is not prejudiced by projects such as those under review by this Panel.

It has saddened me to see how polarized and how crystalized this one issue has become as the project proposals have unfolded. Although it will not necessarily remedy the situation, it may at least help if the Guidelines gave focus to the common thread of basic human rights, whether they apply to individuals or a people.

It is easy to give expression to and support for the wishes of the majority in a democracy, but it takes great humanity to recognize that democracy also is premised on the rights of individuals and minorities. It is no easy task to balance off the forces of global interests and national interests with those of minorities and individuals. In this case, global and national interests are also equated with

Williamson, Sub.

peace and security.

While defence policy and land claims policy are not included in the mandate of this Panel, these issues are at the source of much of the polarity which has been generated by the projects under review. It is my ardent wish that this assessment process can be a forum for rational debate, which will open the hearts and minds of all parties to each other's legitimate concerns and will result in recommendations which will transcend the name calling and labelling of interest groups which have prevailed up to this time.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Panel, this concludes my remarks and I take you once again for this opportunity. I hope that they will be of assistance to the Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Williamson. I can assure you that the Panel shares your hope that this can be truly a worthwhile review.

Just so there is no mistake, I would like to point out that the Panel has not set any time schedule for this review. The tentative time frame that I mentioned earlier in the meeting is only a tentative one and is based on indications that we have received as to when an Environmental Impact Statement might be ready for presentation. It is very, very tentative at this time.

The time to be taken by the Department

of National Defence in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement is entirely up to them. It has been pointed out by Major McCabe that a decision by NATO at the end of this year as to whether it wishes to establish a training centre in Canada or in Turkey will initiate a discussion extending over a period of about two years between the "successful" country and NATO.

So, certainly, I would expect that the Panel would be expected to submit its report sometime within 1988 but we are not, by any means, bound to the sort of the tentative schedule that I mentioned earlier. I would like to have that clarified.

We have come to the end of our afternoon session. We will now adjourn for the dinner period and we will reconvene at seven o'clock.

---Whereupon the afternoon session adjourned for dinner

---Upon Resuming at 7:00 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we would like to begin the evening session, please.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming. For those of you who were not here this afternoon, my name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel. We are ready to begin the second of two sessions scheduled for St. John's.

A list of the intervenors has been posted on the door at the side of the room, for those of you who wish to look at it. We had to set a limit of 20 minutes maximum on individual presentations due to the large number of speakers who registered with us in advance of the meeting. So, I guess, due largely to that, we got through our afternoon list. Because the last speaker listed for the afternoon was not present in the room at 5:20 or so, we went to the first speaker on the evening session, so he has been heard from. We will now go back to the last speaker on the afternoon list and that is Mr. David Thompson. Is Mr. Thompson present in the room? No Mr. Thompson.

He will be present at 20 minutes to 8:00; I see. I was not aware of that. Let us go on with the evening list then.

Is the representative from the Human Rights Association present? Would you care to come forward now, please?

Before you start, simply state your name and affiliation clearly for the record, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MS RITA ANDERSON:

I am Rita Anderson from the Newfoundland-Labrador Human Rights Association.

The Newfoundland-Labrador Human Rights Association is a voluntary organization dedicated to the promotion of and respect for human rights of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Our submission is brief; it consists of presentation of the policy statements that I will read that was adopted by the Newfoundland-Labrador Human Rights Association regarding

Anderson, Sub.

military activity in Labrador and a brief discussion of how this policy statement relates to the Draft Guidelines.

The policy statement goes as follows: "The Human Rights Association ... is aware that there is a divergence of military activity in Labrador and, in particular, concerning a proposed NATO tactical weapons base at Goose Bay. It recognizes that such activity has the potential to establish a dominance of military activity in the air and on the ground in Labrador, which can threaten or impede important aspects of human rights for the people of Labrador, especially for the Innu and Inuit, who have just begun on the path of self-determination through their land claims process.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Charter of the United Nations, and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, recognize the rights of self-determination for 'peoples' as well as for individuals. The aboriginal peoples of Labrador must have these rights safeguarded even though they comprise a minority of the total

Anderson, Sub.

> population of Labrador.
>
> The Human Rights Association ... in support of these rights, recommends that a meaningful consultation mechanism be established and maintained which will allow full participation of the aboriginal people, i.e. the Innu and the Inuit. It also recommends that there be no military activity in Labrador, until a Federal environmental assessment review process is undertaken and completed."

Now, given our concerns, as outlined in the policy statement, we commend the Panel for their sensitivity to the issue of self-determination, as acknowledged in the Draft Guidelines. In particular, we wish to add our support to two issues that the Panel has identified as requiring in-depth analyses.

One, the effects of low level military training on subsisting lifestyles and land use -- this is Issue 2, page 13 of the Draft Guidelines -- and, number two, the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims — Issue 9, page 14 of the Draft Guidelines. We encourage the Panel to especially consider the extent to which military activity might negatively affect lifestyles and land use and the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims.

Anderson, Sub.

To emphasize our concern that military activity might threaten human rights, we recommended last spring no military activity in Labrador until the review process was complete. Although we did not expect military activity to cease, we were surprised to see that the level of military activity is assumed to remain the same or to increase regardless of that outcome of the review process. That is -- quoting where it talks about the scope of the review:

> "...low level flight training has been occurring since 1980, and it is expected to continue and, possibly to increase in the coming years. The Panel has been asked to assist the proponent in designing these activities further to minimize any adverse impact."

That is page 7 of the Draft Guidelines.

We are concerned with the apparent restriction in the range of recommendations that the Panel can make as regards low level flight training. For instance, if the review process reveals the presence of severe adverse impacts associated with low level flying, could the Panel recommend a decrease or even a cessation in low level flying? In the promotion of human rights, we certainly hope so.

In summary, we support and welcome the sensitivity of the Panel to the rights of people, whether they be individuals or groups, majorities or

Anderson, Sub.
minorities.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

I have been informed that Mr. Thompson has arrived. So, if he is prepared to do so, I would invite him to come to the table.

Would you tell us, sir, if you are speaking on behalf of any particular group or as a private individual?

MR. DAVID THOMPSON: I am speaking as a private individual, I represent no group. I apologize for not being here when you first called. I understood I was coming on at a quarter to eight.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DAVID THOMPSON:

I want to speak directly to the Guidelines and make a number of suggestions for changes and particularly for insertions in them, not because I particularly disagree with the Guidelines, in fact I think they are, for the most part, very well developed. Most of my comments will be ones, I think, to clarify certain aspects of them and, to a certain extent perhaps, to widen the implications of the Guidelines.

I want, in particular, to address myself to the overall issues of legality and of morality and, what I want to call, cultural moral fibre. All three issues are connected with this project in various ways. I will explain what I mean by each of these as I come to them. In each case, as I say, I wish to make about

Thompson, Sub.

two insertions into the Guidelines at various points.

While I am not representing any particular group, it is perhaps of some interest to know that my profession is philosophy, so my concern with these is something of a professional nature.

First, the issue of law, of legality, and, in particular, of international law. Internal domestic law within Canada must, of course, be in accord with the accepted norms of international law, so it seems to me that the impact of international law on this project needs to be examined by the Panel during the review process. This might sound, in a different context, somewhat academic in the worst sense, except for the fact, as you may well know, there have been a number of will be a number of important cases which have been taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, cases which I think have some implications or parellel cases that could have implications for this project.

I am referring, in particular, to the Supreme Court decision on Cruise missile testing in Alberta and the suit which I think has not yet been prepared but is coming in the near future challenging the right of the Canadian Government to make agreements concerning nuclear weapons in Canada. That, too, is expected to go to the Supreme Court of Canada as well. It seems to me it would be unfortunate if this project were to get, say, halfway through and then

Thompson, Sub.

discover that there was a Supreme Court injunction preventing it on grounds that it violated domestic or international law. It seems to be quite important that the Panel and that the process consider the implications for international law and domestic legality of the project and the different aspects of the project, both bilateral aspects and the NATO training aspects.

Therefore, I want to insert in paragraph 6.2.2, basically in the second sentence, although it does not much matter where -- at present it reads:

> "This Section should describe the purposes of the project and how it fits into international, national or regional treaties, plans, agreements or requirements."

I would like to add, just to make that a little bit more explicit, the proponent should supply evidence to demonstrate that the aims or results of the project do not violate the provisions of the St. Petersburg Declaration, the various Hague declarations, the Geneva Conventions, especially the 1977 protocols on the environment, the Nuremburg Tribunal, the U.N. Charter and Declarations and similar instruments of international law.

Secondly, in 6.3, on the top of page 19 where it presently reads:

"The proponent must ensure that the plans

Thompson, Sub.

for the project respect applicable laws."

I would like to specify that more precisely by inserting after "laws", "international laws". I may add that I do not think that is going to be any great chore for the Department of National Defence. They do, of course, have a direct route of international law which, I am sure, is perfectly capable of advising them on this point.

My second issue concerns not legality but morality. It seems to me that the ultimate aim for the project should be considered from a moral viewpoint. Whether the project should go ahead or not must depend not only on the impact of the specific means which are chosen, that is training, but on the goal which it finally hopes to achieve. Is the goal of this project ultimately the defence of Canada, or the defence of our NATO allies, or is it the stability and peace of the world as a whole? Is this goal, whichever it is, a morally acceptable one and can we expect a project, in fact, to take us closer to it?

Therefore, I want to insert, somewhere in 5.0, I do not really care much where, possibly at the very end, maybe (10), the overall moral implications of the project, in particular its affect on world peace and human survival as one of the items which should be considered.

If the goal is morally acceptable and if these are reasonable means to attain them, it is

Thompson, Sub.

possible that the means might nonetheless violate the rights of individuals along the way. Now, considerable recent philosophical and theoretical work has been done by political scientists and by philosophers to discuss the kinds of conflicts which arise between individual human rights and utilitarian considerations for society as a whole. I am thinking particularly of John Rawls' book on the theory of justice,but there have been many other discussions of this in academic circles in recent years.

It seems to me that experts on such matters should be consulted during the assessment because, even if the overall goals of the project and the means chosen are ones which are morally acceptable, we must consider the effects on individuals along the way. Therefore, I would like to insert, also in 5(1), perhaps (11),the extent to which it is theoretically permissible to override individual rights in the interests of social utility.

Thirdly, after legality and morality, I want to discuss another issue which is a little harder to pin down and which, for want of a better term, I am going to call cultural moral fibre. It is not quite the same as the issue of the morality of the project or of the means for the project.

One of the most essential aspects of any culture is what we might call its moral fibre, by which I mean the extent to which the general population

Thompson, Sub.

guides its actions by moral norms rather than by personal interest. When cynicism about morality breaks out, lesser norms, such as human rights or the value of the environment, are quickly submerged. While we could think of Nazi Germany as the most obvious example, the recent history of, say, Argentina or El Salvador or many other countries around the world that now have military governments, illustrates very clearly the point.

The point is that if the faith of the population in morality, if the importance of judging decisions by moral norms is lost, the whole culture deteriorates. So, the cultural environment, if taken in a wide sense, must include the overall respect for morality. So, I want to include, under 6.5, the long term impact of a more militarized activity on the cultural and moral attitudes of the population must be considered.

Now, while military activities may well, in themselves, be morally justifiable, the long term militarization of society is likely to result in a "might is right" approach to life. Similarly, economic dependence on military activities put psychological and institutional barriers in the way of disarmament or of conversion of wartime to a peacetime economy or from just a war to a peace economy. Since our government's policy is one of reducing world armament and since many of our institutions, such as the churches

Thompson, Sub.

and the Canadian Labour Congress, have advocated conversion of military industry to civilian production, we need to be sure that further investment in military activities does not undermine the moral and institutional will that we have on these matters.

Therefore, I think we should insert, under 6.5, the extent to which dependence on a militarized economy might inhibit future Canadian disarmament options should be studied.

Those are my insertions on these three points, on legality, on morality and, what I want to call, moral fibre.

To conclude, let me point out that it seems to me important that the FEARO process be properly perceived. That it not be perceived as a process simply facilitating a policy which has already been decided elsewhere or will be decided elsewhere. It should not be assumed by the public or by those who look at the process from outside that the project is basically justified and that the only issues which we have to consider are the minor ones of how it should actually be implemented. The public, in other words, should not have a perception of the Panel as simply fiddling while Rome burns.

To avoid this, I think I must tackle directly the real issues which are at the centre of the question as to whether or not the project should go ahead at all or not -- either of the projects,

Thompson, Sub.

because basically I think there are two of them involved.

I, therefore, think that the Guidelines, which are very comprehensive on many points, could be improved in a number of ways by the addition of these five or six insertions which I have proposed to you.

I would also like to say that I appreciate very much the opportunity to address the Panel. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir, you are quite welcome. If you have a copy of your presentation, we would appreciate receiving it. If not immediately, whenever you can.

Our next speaker is Alison Dyer speaking on behalf of NAPO.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. GEOFF CARRE:

MR. GEOFF CARRE: I am with NAPO also.

The North Atlantic Peace Organization was formed this year bringing together individuals from peace, native, environmental and social justice backgrounds to consolidate our opposition to the growing militarization of Canada.

NAPO is concerned about the increasing use of the Quebec/Labrador Peninsula for low level training flights by NATO military aircraft in the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter and Weapons Training Centre for Goose Bay, Labrador.

In general, we believe the Draft

Carre, Sub.

Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Statement to be fairly rigorous. However, the Guidelines are fatally flawed because the terms of reference for the Environmental Assessment Panel are too restricted. As they presently stand, the terms of reference do not permit; one, an assessment for the need for low level flying in the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre and, two, any consideration of the fact that the military expansion prejudices Native land claims and Aboriginal rights in the Quebec-Labrador peninsula.

We do not wish to speak in detail to the second issue, except to echo the concerns of the Innu and urge that these concerns be forwarded to the Ministers of Enviornment and National Defence and request that the terms of reference for the Environmental Assessment Panel be expanded. As to the first issue, we intend to show here that the project is not needed because: a) the current proposed low level flight training will not accomplish NATO's intended purpose of raising the nuclear threshold; and b) emerging technologies will likely render this type of training obsolete.

Our first concern is the problem posed by the failure of the Environmental Assessment Panel to assess the need for low level flying and the proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. As it presently stands, you have requested that the Department

Carre, Sub.

of National Defence state the need for military expansion, "in order to weigh adequately the environmental and socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the project". Unfortunately, you must accept verbatim DND's justification for these developments without being able to critically appraise the arguments put forth by the DND and without providing the public any opportunity to evaluate these arguments.

DND has but to say that the low level flying is absolutely essential for national security and, as a result, you will be heavily swayed in the direction of allowing the project to go ahead, regardless of serious negative impacts that may be identified.

NAPO's position, moreover, is that if in fact we do assess the need for the project, we will discover that the current proposed training is counterproductive to its intended purpose. Ostensibly, the purpose of the air combat training activities involving simulated deep strikes with Phantom II, F-4, Tornado GR-1 and Fighting Falcon F-16 aircraft is to improve NATO's intentional deterrence and flexible response strategy so as to raise nuclear threshold, i.e. postpone the moment of esclating to nuclear weapons to avert conventional defeat. In our view, these activities will lower the nuclear threshold.

The low level flight training is part of

Carre, Sub.

a relatively new NATO war fighting doctrine known as "Follow on Forces Attack" or "Deep Strike". Deep Strike, which stresses the deep penetration of Warsaw Pact Soviet defences with a variety of conventionally armed missiles and aircraft is a high destabilizing doctrine for the following main reasons.

One, it blurs the distinction between nuclear and conventional arms due to the quasi-nuclear nature of the weapons and the dual capability of their delivery systems and, thus, makes escalation to nuclear level more likely. Two, by stressing offence, Deep Strike is inherently threatening to Soviet strategic installations and, in the event of war, could provoke the Warsaw Pact to escalate rapidly to the nuclear level. Three, it will not lead to any significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal as new battlefield nuclear weapons are under development. Four, by introducing a new generation of weaponry, the Deep Strike strategy has serious implications for arms control and arms reduction negotiations.

---SUBMISSION BY ALISON DYER:

Our second concern is that because there is no room to assess the need for the low level flying and the proposed TFWTC, the Panel cannot determine whether or not these training activities will soon be made obsolete. One could argue, in fact, that such training has been rendered obsolete for the following reasons.

Dyer, Sub.

One, the Deep Strike tasks assigned to the low flying aircraft be more effectively carried out by conventionally armed or nuclear tipped cruise, Pershing II, Trident missiles, Incredible Hulks, et cetera. Military analysts have determined that attrition rates for aircraft in modern conventional war could be as high as 40 per cent per mission, which is totally unacceptable to any government. According to a recent report in "The Economist", NATO air forces would lose almost as many aircraft per mission as they destroyed on the ground.

The second point is that new methods of surveillance, such as the Joint Surveillance and Target Acquisition Radar System may soon make it possible to monitor the movements of tank and truck formations as well as low flying aircraft. The Soviet Union may soon have technology similar to the JSTARS. Thus, there may be already no necessity for NAPO's fear of flying due to this enhanced surveillance capability.

The question is, then, if low level flying is already obsolete, why develop an expensive facility to conduct more of the same. Surely, this is only in fighting economic disaster for the Happy Valley-Goose Bay region, which has already gone through two boom/bust periods, World War II and the USAF SAC base. Facilities will be built up once again in Goose Bay to allow expanded low level flying, just to have NATO determine that low level flying is obsolete and

Dyer, Sub.

will be phased out.

NATO's position is, therefore, that a proper assessment of the long term socio-economic impacts of the training and planned NATO TFWTC cannot presently be undertaken under the restricted terms of reference because an assessment of the need for the training cannot be conducted to determine what the lifespan of the training will be.

If the training is obsolete, which we argue it is, then Happy Valley-Goose Bay is already looking at a boom/bust type of development which could very well have severe negative long term socio-economic consequences for the region. We, therefore, recommend that you forward to the Ministers of the Environment and National Defence our concern that the terms of reference are too narrow because they do not permit an assessment of the need for the project and thereby hinder a thorough socio-economic impact assessment.

Moreover, by restricting the terms of reference in this way, the public is effectively denied the opportunity to criticize the need for the project. The public must have the right to challenge DND's argument for the need for military expansion, especially since these arguments play a vital role in the Environmental Assessment Panel's weighing of environmental and socio-economic benefits and disadvantages of proceeding or not proceeding with the project.

Dyer, Sub.

Thank you.

We would like to clear up one thing we heard this afternoon. There was a comment from the Panel that you would actually be looking into the need. Could you clarify that? It is page 16.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what I said this afternoon is that the Panel wants to gain a full understanding of the justification for the project. In doing so, we will allow an opportunity for the public to comment on Department of National Defence's statement of justification, if you want to put it that way, and we will look at those comments side by side with the justification provided by National Defence in the Impact Statement. We are not blocking out public comment on that subject. We think that hearing that comment may help us to understand better what that justification may be.

MS DYER: But is the Panel in a position to question DND's arguments; are you in a position to dispute the need; are you in a position to reject the arguments that DND puts forth?

THE CHAIRMAN: As you know, the terms of reference of the Panel exclude examination of Canada's defence policy. Now, presumably, a part of that policy would be some of the justification for the project. Whether or not the leeway to question a justification of a particular project without questioning the overlying policy itself, is I think the question that you are asking. Right now I do not believe I can provide an answer for that. It is something that the Panel will have to look at very hard.

MS DYER: So, as it stands now, then, the way the Guidelines are stated on page 16, it is not a mistake in the way it is written. It should be:

> "The Panel is not mandated to pass judgment on the need for the proposed project."

Is that correct, or will these Guidelines be...

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not have a copy of the terms of reference with me right now. I believe that it is also not forbidden, we were just not asked to pass judgment on the need for the project.

MR. CARRE: It states in the FEARO Guidelines that you can ask the Ministers from each department -- you can ask them to include in the Guidelines the discussion on the need for the base and the socio-economic impact.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which document are you referring to?

MR. CARRE: This is from the Canada Gazette.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Order-in-Council?

MR. CARRE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CARRE: So, you are able to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Normally, a Panel examining a proposal is quite entitled to examine the need, the justification. I would see that this Panel would be able to do the same thing as long as it did not extend into questioning the underlying policy, the defence policy of the Government of Canada.

MR. CARRE: Then just to reiterate, we feel that the Guidelines, then, as they stand, are flawed for those reasons.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next scheduled speaker is Dr. John Ross speaking on behalf of Canadian Physicians for Prevention Against Nuclear War.

Dr. Ross?

---SUBMISSION BY DR. JOHN ROSS:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I see there is a lack of women on the Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were you present this afternoon, sir?

DR. ROSS: No, I was not present this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did explain that the Panel did have one female member. Unfortunately, that lady has found it necessary to resign from the Panel as of a couple of weeks ago. We are seeking a suitable replacement. I cannot promise you that it will be a lady, of course.

DR. ROSS: I am speaking on behalf of

Ross, Sub.

what was Physicians for Social Responsibility but which has been renamed the Canadian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the Newfoundland chapter.

First of all, I would like to commend the Panel on the majority of the Guidelines they have drawn up and the rigorous nature of these, and I recognize the difficulty of being all-encompassing. The brief that I am going to present is directed to these Draft Guidelines of the Environmental Impact Statement with particular regard to the public health aspects, which I think is about the only thing I am truly qualified to speak on in any way, and the general health of individuals concerned.

However, at the outset, I think it should be stated the Panel might seem to be wasting its time because if, as stated, they are not mandated to pass judgment on any need for the proposed military actvities in Labrador, one would wonder perhaps why the Panel is necessary. Does the government truly wish the public or expert witness input or is the Department of National Defence going to act unilaterally anyway, in spite of any recommendations the Panel may propose; is there any assurance that the findings of the Panel will be acted upon or at least considered, if not; and how can the public be assured of this?

The second point is with regard to the noise levels of all types of aircraft after great deal of work has been done on this already. It has been fairly well documented, they have looked at both military and ordinary aircraft. The conclusions have already been reached that any noise levels in excess of 90 decibels do carry some risk to hearing and that in excess of 120 decibels -- and this is well below the level of the sound of screaming jets overhead -- that there is just certain damage to hearing. I myself are a living example of damage to hearing through loud noise, weapons going off in one's ear and that kind of thing.

The noise of low flying jet aircraft such as is used in Labrador is well in excess. The United States Navy and the Air Force have examined the effects of both noise — and this includes sonic booms — and they have also examined the psychological impact on civilian populations. The effects have been noted — they are all adverse -- in the highlands of Scotland. Too much time should not be spent by the Panel going over what has already been very adequately dealt with as being a harmful fact of life to other human beings.

Next, going on to the other recommendations The Panel is directed to the fact that military technology, particularly with regard to the use of aircraft, is notoriously short-lived and should be very changeable. The effects on economies that have had to depend on military activity and subsequently withdrawn should be studied very carefully, in order to determine the needs of such communities when the military do withdraw because, invariably, they leave

Ross, Sub.

a void and a hiatus and it takes a long time to fill because there is very little coming to the vacuum for a considerable time afterwards. This would particularly true for somewhere like Labrador.

The socio-economic and psychological effect of abrupt cessation of employment should be studied equally carefully, with particular references to places like Labrador. The long term effects of late unemployment, which would result of a sudden exodus of the military after having been the main employer for any length of time, Labrador has already had this once -- would be a blow to both the physical and mental health of the population. There are already such examples to be found in Newfoundland, as well as other provinces. The rate of alcoholism and many other things goes up as soon as unemployment hits, particularly unemployment after a long period of employment and when people cannot get employment, having been employed for a considerable period of time. It would be well worth studying this.

I worked for a considerable time at the United States Naval Base nearby Argentia and I c vouch for the fact that there are many people who stopped work from that time forth and have never worked since. They have not been productive members of society from the time the base pulled out. It is well worth studying and it is a health matter.

The employability of the Innu people, I think, is something also that should be studied,

Ross, Sub.

particularly in the long term, the profound psychological effects on them when they find they are almost certain to be bypassed for the majority of employment except the most menial. I think this should be understood. Any Native and indigenous population, where peoples go in with high technology, tend to be the lowest people on the totem pole for any form of employment. Psychologically they are damaged. They are the people who get the least out of any exercise of this kind and, after all, we are in their country.

Finally, the Innu people who choose to return to their traditional way of life are going to be a minority, I would imagine. The majority are going to maintain the status quo or else they are going to try to upgrade and get into the 20th century in the socio and technological society. However, even these, with the best that modern medicine can offer them, their health status is equal to the most underdeveloped country in the world at the moment. The Innu peoples' health generally, even with all that modern medicine can offer them, is one of the lowest.

The only way to improve this is going to be by education and by singularly addressing the particular and peculiar problems that a cultural change takes place. I am not certain in any way that they are going to be benefitted by something like a military base. Whether the military base will go anywhere

Ross, Sub.

towards addressing some of these needs is very doubtful but should be looked at critically, particularly again, from a health point of view.

Finally or just before the end, there seems to be nowhere in the mandate to examine the destabilizing effect on the escalation of the arms race that such a NATO base would entail that some of the activities envisaged would create. The capability of some of the planes, as well as Typhoons, to carry nuclear weapons is well recognized and so is the intent of the Deep Strike strategy. It is bound to cause a base such as this to be singled out as a prime target in the event of any hostilities. It is just bound to be an immediate consequence. The psychological effect of this on the population living there should be studied carefully. Already it has been recognized by psychologists and psychiatrists that the threat of nuclear warfare does affect people profoundly and particularly the very young. These people are going to be reminded day after day, hour after hour, flying 140 sorties a day by 200 aircraft, that they are, indeed, at the sharp end of any delivery system. The psychological effects of this on the indigenous populations, both Innu and people who have come in since, should be carefully weighed.

Finally, the effects of non-ionizing radiation, such as those used in aircraft guidance systems, I do not see very much of this in the

Ross, Sub.

Guidelines. It should be studied. They are relatively unknown. There is a lot of initial work coming out. Even in medical diagnostic work, I am not certain yet -- it took us a generation to discover the effects of X-rays. They seemed to be totally harmless. Non-ionizing radiation, I notice on the sides of aircraft, "Danger. Do not come within 25 feet".

You have in place threat emitters, the aircraft guidance systems, the scoring systems for combat training, all of which are non-ionizing radiation. Not only that, the building of the NORAD systems up north will produce an additional source of non-ionizing radiation, particularly with earth-satellite transmitters. It is felt that this aspect of health should be very, very carefully evaluated. I can find very little in the literature today that has evaluated it in any real concrete manner. However, I think it is something that should be borne in mind.

Thank you for hearing me.

6A-1

':ET

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Just as a point of clarification, I have been glancing at a copy of the Terms of Reference of the Panel. It confirms my memory on this. There is nothing in those Terms of Reference forbidding the Panel from examining and commenting on the justification that may be put forward for this particular project. So I suppose the Panel could assume, in spite of what we said in the Guidelines, that it would be allowed to comment upon the justification put forward by the proponents, but, as I say, only within the given policy of the Government of Canada on the defence of the country.

The next listing I have on my schedule of intervenors is an entry that reads United Nations Associations. I apologize if we have gotten that wrong. I am not quite sure what it means, but if the person wishes to speak, and is here, I would ask him or her to come forward and perhaps a little more fully the affiliation.

Is there somebody here to speak under that heading?

Just a moment, please.

It has been pointed out to me that this entry may already have been covered by one of the speakers this afternoon, so that clears that up.

In that case, the next scheduled intervenor is the Chamber of Commerce of the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. IAN STRACHAN:

MR. STRACHAN: My name is Ian Strachan. I President of the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce. I have no formal presentation to make to you. We made a presentation this afternoon, as you realize, on behalf of the Mokami Project Group of which the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce is one of the proponent groups. However, I was instructed by our executive to address a couple of points and I would like to address these, in addition to what we had to say earlier this afternoon.

Our Chamber is 25 years old. It consists of totally 167 small businesses, most of them very small businesses in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. As you realize, the economic growth of Happy Valley-Goose Bay is intertwined, absolutely and totally, with the growth of the airport. As the airport grows or recedes, then so does the growth of the business community and the economic welfare of the community.

Through the seventies we have seen a downturn in the economic growth in the businesses in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. We must indicate to you now that with the renewed interest in the use of the Goose Bay Airport then there has been, quite obviously and openly, an upturn in the economy. We are seeing new businesses opening. There is a vibrancy about the community, a liveliness about the community, in the small business sense. Many small businesses

Strachan, Sub.

are expanding; there have been many new housing starts and you can see from that point of view, therefore, that what is occurring is that the increased use of the airport is allowing this increase in the economy.

Our problem that we see, very clearly, is that Happy Valley-Goose Bay is not a mining town, it is not a seaport town, it is not a hydro town and, although I am in the industry, it is not a forestry town. It is, by and large, a military town and without the military, then I ask you, quite candidly: What are we going to do with 8000 people who would not be able to basically survive in the method they are surviving and what are we going to do with the businesses which would obviously have to close down or leave? We feel very strongly -- and obviously, I speak on behalf of the businesses there -- we feel very strongly, therefore, that this development and military development and use of the airfield must continue.

Unusually so, from a business point of view, I would like to reiterate again our position to the Panel. It is obvious, as has been stated quite clearly, that the item of land claims is out with your jurisdiction. It may surprise you and may surprise, in fact, the peace people, and the people who are involved with the Innu and the Native groups that, as a group of business people, we are totally and thoroughly in favour of the Panel looking at the

Strachan, Sub.

whole issue of land claims, and your mandate should be broadened to allow you to do so. We say that because we fundamentally believe that any development in Labrador, whether it be military development -- and I said this earlier on, but I will reiterate it -- any development, Gull Island or a pulp mill or an aluminum smelter, it must be fundamental that the issue of land claims -- and I am not talking about a strict little territory, looking for land, I am talking about the total issue of self-determination -- must be addressed and, although that has been stated to be outside of your mandate by both the provincial and federal governments, we as a group of business people might want to shock the government in stating that we feel fundamentally that that should be included and is fundamental to any other issue in Labrador.

Basically, most of the other points were raised in the Mokami Project Group. I think we believe that your terms of reference are thorough. We think you have a great deal of work to do and we would like to thank you for the opportunity of presenting, both on behalf of the Mokami Project Group and the Chamber of Commerce, our comments.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

I have next on the list the Town Council of Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. HERB BRETT:

Brett, Sub.

MR. BRETT: My name is Herb Brett. I am a tow councillor and elected member, representing the people of the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

First of all, I have to admire your God-given patience to put up with all of this garbage that we are all getting on with here today, because there is so much of it, and if you have the ability to thrash out all the pros and cons of this and put this paper together that you are charged with that responsibility, I would say that you and your Panel are wonderful people.

We made a presentation to this group before and it was documented, but we wanted to have the opportunity this afternoon, if we could, with your further patience because our town is affected so much to maybe make some comments.

It appears that, for some reason -- I always thought we were the good guys -- but for some reason we are made to be warmongers in this whole process. We are having problems with that because we see this development as a development that not only is being pursued by the federal government but also supported by our provincial government from all parties of the House of Assembly and I do not know why the issue has to be raised regarding whether we should have a development of this nature and, for that reason, we would question the guidelines -- and I say this to be a devil's advocate -- but maybe that

Brett, Sub.

they are too broad.

I mean, what we see is a bunch of people doing a little bit of training in a big land that is vast, over 100,000 square miles, that is uninhabited, to do some training to defend democracy and Christianity and how anyone can dispute that type of stuff and create a circus out of this Panel situation or these hearings by talking about having peace by laying down our arms. We have our own peace movement. We figure we are making a contribution to peace and by being strong and having our people trained so that if there is more conflict, that we will be in a position to be able to certainly defend that. Our town is getting, for some reason, we feel, by people, many people, a black mark and we are having problems with that. We would like for your Panel, in your next round of negotiations, to look at ways to remain within the Guidelines of an environmental impact with the effects of low level flying.

We seem as if we have gotten into a seminar on the politics of peace and I do not think that that is what this should be all about. At least, when we understood that it was set up, we were not going to get into that and, for that reason, I say that the terms are definitely broad and maybe too broad and that I would like to see the terms of reference be restricted to what your mandate is, and that is the environmental aspect of low-level flying.

Brett, Sub.

We thought in the beginning it would be the effects it would have on caribou and wildlife and some of the social implications of increased activity.

I would like to reiterate a word that was said earlier. Remember: Goose Bay -- and I think we lose sight of this sometimes -- the Goose was, by Eric Fry and Roosevelt 40 years ago when they went to Uncle Bob's berry patch and saw this great terrain -- that they saw that as a great place for military development and that has been the basis of Goose Bay since the beginning of our time. This year, our community is celebrating its 25th anniversary of incorporation, so we are a fairly new community and sometimes, I guess, in our tender years, we find it is hurting us a little bit, with the media in particular, impact of these hearings and the write-ups that we are getting regarding the effects of it. So I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, that very serious consideration be given to the type of discussions and dialogues that have gone on in this draft guideline situation and that you would consider restricting the discussion. Also, maybe I should ask you, if it is fair to ask that: Is it fair to ask that we restrict the discussion to what we are talking about and that is, you know, the environmental impact of low-level flying on the basis that it is going to be a fact of life?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Brett, I do not feel that the Panel has gone beyond the mandate

Brett, Sub.

that was given to it. Certainly, the Panel feels that it has not exceeded that mandate. It has been pointed out to us that the project may have some effects on the outcome of land claims negotiations, for example, and we feel that it is possible for us to listen to arguments on that subject and to reach some conclusions and make recommendations on that subject without violating the exclusion that is in the terms of reference, namely, that the Panel is not mandated to address the policy of the government of Canada on land claims. So we do not feel that, in that area, we have exceeded our mandate.

On the subject of the justification for the project, for example, as I said before, it is quite common in an environmental impact assessment, as part of the background to considering the possible impacts and what to do about them, to understand fully what the project is and why it is needed or why the proponent perceives that it is needed. So, there again, since the terms of reference do not either give us a mandate to examine that justification or forbid us from examining that justification, I believe that the Panel would be within its rights to examine very carefully the justification that is put forward and to listen to arguments from the public on that subject. So, as I say, I do not believe and the Panel do not believe that it has gone beyond its mandate in any area.

MR. BRETT: Well, I can accept

Brett, Sub.

some of that but you mentioned the Innu, and that is a real concern of the people of our community that there is a wedge somehow being driven between us two and the Innu. Sheshatshit, in particular, is our neighbouring community and the last thing we want to do is create any problems amongst each other. We all use each other's services. I mean, our Innu friends from Sheshatshit come and shop in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, they take advantage of our sports facilities and participate in our bingos and our way of life that we all have. Somehow, we also have this problem of a division coming here and that is another thing that we would like to see, that that does not happen. That is why we ask that the mandate be probably restricted in some ways because there is no doubt in our minds that we have a real problem, not with the Innu, but the peace movement in particular, that are using us and them and everyone else to fight a case of something else that, in our opinion, is full of macaroni. I mean, we find that peace is by strength and if anyone can convince me, and I challenge anyone to convince me, that you can have peace by laying down your arms, and this is my last kick at the cat, Mr. Chairman, by laying down your arms and that is going to develop peace, why they have to be a great person to convince me of that.

That is where we have a real problem with it and somehow, we would like to see that restricted, if that is possible in this whole process, especially in the next round of discussions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brett.

Just as a final comment, I would say that the Panel is certainly dismayed by what appears to be a conflict between two resident populations in Labrador. It is a sad situation and it does not help at all the climate within which the Panel is being expected to examine all of the issues and to try to come up with some sort of recommendations to government about how to resolve all this.

MR. BRETT: I do not know if I might be able to say this but it seems to be where it gets wrapped up in the media hype or something of the whole thing. I would not necessarily say that it is the Panel but that is probably that is the challenge of the Panel. But it is the media hype and the things that are unfounded that get said and the statements that are made. I mean, we just listened to someone talking about ears and it being hard on your hearing. We said it earlier today that we have had some medical people come in and there is no problem with ears. We live right by the runways, some of our people, and we do not have any problem with any hearing. We have more noise than we will ever get with a plane flying over in the country. So these types of statements that are false and unsubstantiated and unfounded are the types of things that I am talking about that we have a problem with.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brett.

We have received a late registration from another group that wants to be heard, but I think before we go to that, we might have a break at this point. Is there coffee ready outside at the present time? Could anybody tell me that? Yes, I understand there is.

So, since we will have some time left, if anyone else would care to speak after the break, then, please, let the Secretariat know. We will come back at 8:30.

---Short recess

---Upon resuming at 8:35 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have three additional speakers listed at the bottom of my list of intervenors.

The first is the Wilderness Society of Newfoundland and Labrador, Dr. Rice.

---SUBMISSION BY DR. JACOB RICE:

DR. RICE: Thank you, David. Sorry we did not get back to you to request a place. I figured by now we would be considered fixtures at these sessions.

I am speaking on behalf of the

Rice, Sub.

Wilderness Society, and our submission will address environmental issues in the strict sense of the word, not because we feel they are the only issues involved in this matter but because they are the issues that the Wilderness Society has tried to develop and maintain expertise in. We are quite glad to see other issues raised by other groups.

In general, the Wilderness Society of Newfoundland and Labrador was quite favourably impressed with the content and the format of the Draft Guidelines for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on military flying activities in Quebec and Labrador, hereinafter referred to as the Draft Guidelines.

Compared to guidelines for several other projects we have followed with interest, these Draft Guidelines are quite comprehensive and specific. If the final EIS fulfills all that is set out for it, the ability of Canadians to make wise decisions on whether or not to proceed with any part of the undertakings that are described will be greatly enhanced. Despite our generally favourable reception of the Draft Guidelines, there are several points which need to be expanded or clarified. We will detail those points below.

Also, so that we do not appear to be yet another strictly negative environmental group, we will note several places where provisions of the draft guidelines are particularly appropriate as

Rice, Sub.

prepared. We wish the Panel well in the task ahead of them.

In Section 3.0, the Panel have been asked to:

> «Assist the proponent in designing these activities...»

that is, low-level flight training

> «...further to minimize any adverse impact.»

We hope that early in the environmental assessment process we will all be told much more about these potential existing adverse impacts. We are not looking for some sort of confession of gross environmental deterioration arising from past levels of training flights but we do want the proponent to allow interested parties to share whatever is known of impacts of the previous low-level flight training.

These flights have been going on since at least 1980. Any environmentally-responsible proponent naturally would have been monitoring consequences of their undertakings out of a genuine concern for environmental quality, regardless of whether or not such monitoring was required by a regulatory agency.

We want the Panel to ensure the proponent will make both the study designs and data from the existing monitoring projects available early in the process. Then all participants can pursue

Rice, Sub.

their investigations and prepare their submissions from as solid a factual basis as possible because, although the Panel hearings will not be judicial proceedings, it is important for their success that we all proceed from a common and complete factual basis, rather than from conjecture, speculation and large doses of optimism by proponents and pessimism by intervenors.

The previous flight training has another important implications which must be more explicitly recognized in the Guidelines. In Section 6.4, page 27, it is noted that the description of the existing environment is intended

> «to provide the context or base line description of the environment against which the impacts of the project can be identified and evaluated.»

We wish the final Guidelines to differentiate clearly between the true, unimpacted base line, conditions prior to commencement of low-level flight training in 1980 and the current state of the environment which precedes the proposed weapons training and precedes escalated frequency of flights but may already be altered by existing levels of low level flight training. The state of the environment should be described as fully and quantitatively as possible for both conditions. Likewise, any data gaps should be identified for both the earlier base line and for current conditions.

Rice, Sub.

The mandate of the Panel has already been discussed by many intervenors. We, too, noted the provision of Section 6.2.2 that the Panel is not mandated to pass judgment on the need for the project. I note that this provision is at variance with provisions of many other EIS reviews that we have participated in. It raises some new and challenging questions, especially regarding how the Panel will arrive at its final recommendations. Particularly in environmental contexts, we have all learned that there is no such thing as a free lunch. There will be some costs to any undertaking. The EIS is supposed to make any foreseeable costs as explicit and as quantitative as possible. These costs are weighed against the benefits which are also detailed in the EIS, so in deciding what to recommend regarding whether or not to proceed, appropriate constraints can be put in place.

Although spin-off economic benefits of the undertaking will still be evaluated, usually the major benefits of an undertaking are exactly the need for the proposed project. If Panel and hearing participants cannot get into the need for the project, this seems grossly unfair to the proponent. Disallowing them the right to present the primary justification for their undertaking, this is a very strange set of circumstances and could easily be interpreted as implying the proponent suspects the need itself will not universally be considered

Rice, Sub.

of benefit.

The Panel has laudably requested that the proponent provide enough justification

> «for the Panel to understand the reasons for the project.»

We would like some provision in the guidelines to ensure that the Panel share enough of those reasons with us that we, too, understand the justification and rationale for the project.

In keeping with our promise to say some nice things about the Draft Guidelines, we note that the heart of the Guidelines are well prepared, clear, detailed and generally complete. Sections 4, 5 and 6 in particular evoke few comments from us.

In Section 4, our only comment is that provision 2 specifiying spatial and temporal boundaries may prove difficult to apply. If a consequence of the undertaking is, for example, the disruption of normal movement patterns of caribou, the repercussions of that disruption may spread well beyond the area which might appear now to be a reasonable spatial boundary. We trust the proponent will be directed to interpret this provision generously, not restrictively.

In Section 5, issues, one consideration should be added under .5, impacts on the natural environment. Development of the base, whether for just flight training or with weapons training

Rice, Sub.

as well, may well lead to substantial increases in the population of central Labrador for at least some parts of each year and greater affluence for at least some part of that population.

Many of the most important recreational activities in the region are based outdoors, for example, recreational hunting and fishing, recreational use of off-road vehicles. Such activities can be good uses of our environmental heritage but they are not without their environmental consequences. We wish to see a thorough analysis of this potential impact on the natural environment. This analysis should include projected increases in levels of these activities which may result from more people with more disposable income and the cumulative impact of these usage levels on the natural environment over the lifetime of the project. The potential for conflicts between increased numbers of recreational users of these resources and subsistence users should also be addressed.

The provisions of Section 6 are also good. However, this undertaking differs in a key way from many other large projects. Unlike offshore hydrocarbon development or major hydroelectric projects, this undertaking could be realized as a number of small undertakings phased in over several years. Indeed, the use of the area for low level flights has been developed in exactly that way.

Rice, Sub.

Under the provision that the proponent identify and describe all associated projects, we want all alternative scenarios for realizing any part of their major component of this undertaking to be included. At the least, to the extent that the proponent is committed to implement recommendations of the Panel for the two major components of the undertaking, we wish to see it clearly stated that the same commitment exists with regard to any pieces of the project.

In Section 6.3.3, the proponent is asked to detail ways in which people would be kept out of a weapons training area. We also want to hear what provisions will be made to keep wildlife out of such an area.

Correspondingly, we need to know the cumulative loss of habitat for valued wildlife populations over the lifespan of the project and see an evaluation of the impact of that loss on those populations.

We are concerned, both in Section 3 and 6.4.1, that little attention is given to the potential for increased erosion and siltation of water bodies to result from either low-level flight training or especially weapons training. We wish to see the Guidelines specify the potential for and impacts of changes in run-off patterns of watersheds be dealt with in the EIS.

Finally, we note that there are

Rice, Sub.

provisions for formal risk assessment of some aspects of the low-level flights. When discussing the possibility that some data

«are not available and cannot reasonably be collected»,

page 27, the proponent is asked simply to describe the implications of any such data gaps. Exactly in areas where hard quantitative data are lacking, simulation studies and other schools of formal risk assessment are often particularly useful. Where serious data gaps exist, we would like to see an explicit requirement that the proponent investigate appropriate studies of worst-case and medium-case scenarios, that the choices of characteristics of worst-case and medium-case scenarios be justified and that results of such investigations be available as part of the review process.

Thank you, David, and the rest of the Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Jake.

The next scheduled speaker is Mr. Cyril Goodyear. Mr. Goodyear?

MR. CYRIL GOODYEAR: John David would like to speak first, and I will follow him.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, then. We will do that. In the meantime, there is a person who wishes to ask a question, I believe.

MR. JOHN HICKEY: Thank you very

much, Mr. Barnes. I was hoping to ask a question to the last gentleman that spoke, if I may.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he might be kind enough to come to the microphone.

MR. HICKEY: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead and ask your question. If you could give us your name, please.

MR. HICKEY: My name is John Hickey and I am from Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

I would like to ask the gentleman about his society because this is the first time I have heard of it. I understand that he represents Newfoundland and Labrador and I would just like to know if you have a chapter of your society in Labrador and how many members you have there.

DR. RICE: We do not have chapters, as such, anywhere on the island. We are a single society, and that I know of I have three different members scattered through the island, through the portion of the province that is Labrador. So three members.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from Colonel John David.

COLONEL JOHN DAVID: Dr. Barnes, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the opportunity to address some of the questions that were asked today that I believe should be answered before the Panel leaves here and that some of the people in here may wish to hear them because I think that the information is available today and that it is best to mention it now.

But, first, before I go on, I would like to compliment the gentleman from the Wilderness organization. I have listened to many presentations and your presentation makes the most sense to me of any of them and I totally agree with that way that we go about this whole thing now and in the future responsibly. You can be assured that our Department will do everything to work in harmony with those types of aspirations because it is in the best interests of, not only our Department but all Canadians.

I would like to say that, with the activity levels, and pass on some information here, to put things in perspective the low level training has been ongoing in Cold Lake, Alberta, for over 20 years, very intensive low level training, more than 200 aircraft on a daily basis or, on occasion, on a daily basis in an area that is 10,000 square kilometres or one-tenth of the area that we currently restrict the low, low flying for military aircraft in Labrador.

In those areas, we have found, because there is limited hunting availability in there, that we have probably the most lucrative wildlife sanctuary in the prairie provinces. I think that it is important to note that and to keep that in mind.

It would seem that, in there, in that area also, we have the aerospace engineering test establishment where the Cruise missile testing has been ongoing, if you follow the papers over the year and it would appear that where we have practice target areas and we have live areas, that the wildlife in the area existence is very compatible.

In fact, one of the greatest pressures upon our Department is to allow hunting in those areas to call the animals, because the overflow of the population from these areas expand into the outlying areas for hunting but there is considerable pressure and it is the same case in Suffield and Wainwright. So I would mention that in passing.

To Goose Bay, the gentleman mentioned about stability of military operations. Goose Bay has been a military operation since its inception. The reason for Goose Bay was for the military. The military activity there, albeit changing over the years, has been the only long-term employment stability in the area and I believe that those people who are from that area will certify that.

With the medical gentleman who was up here who has the great concern for the radar, the non-ionization radars and the impacts of ongoing activity, I would say that there is considerable evidence and documentation available today from the

Central European theatre. Along the Iron Curtain, we have the most powerful radars known to man today, both on the Warsaw Pact side and on the NATO side, both airborne systems and ground-based systems, and this is intermingled with a population, I believe, of over 200 million people. We do not see any great disabilities being caused by these current systems today as a result of that.

So I ask you that perhaps you may wish to consider that and take a look at that mass of evidence of the types of radar.

In Labrador, we have had the most powerful radars in operation for more than 30 years with the CADIN Pine Tree system and we have the airborne warning control systems, radars, working there. They have been for a number of years and we do not see any great disabilities caused by that.

I would mention that we have a complete microwave system across this country, and particularly in Newfoundland and Labrador, for our normal communications on a daily basis with Newfoundland Telephone and those systems are in place. I think that the operation as we see it do so in harmony with all peoples.

This thing keeps coming up, it has come up about three times now: targeting, as a result of a NATO training centre. Let me assure you my job in NATO prior to coming here was the Chief of Operations Analysis for the Fourth Allied Tactical

Air Force. I was specifically responsible for targeting, both for NATO and Warsaw Pact. I know the system.

Let me tell you that a training centre and an airport is probably the lowest priority target that you could ever have. I would suggest to somebody that nuclear power stations, hydro-electric projects and, yes, this harbour in St. John's has greater significance than an airport that, for a major air operation, would not be required. I would use an example as the Falklands, if you would recall that, the air-refuelling capabilities today, and remember the aircraft that we are using today are only training, they are not there for operational purposes.

This training centre that we are talking about here and potentially embarking on or the bilateral training programs that we are looking at are not like an operational facility, like a Cruise missile base or something like that. The long-term security for a training facility means that, as technologies change, that we will still need to train our pilots and train those people to be able to take on the new training that is required. So the long-term stability with the training facility is greater than it is for the type of thing we saw in the sixties with the Strategic Air Command base.

I leave that with you.

With the question by the legal officer

today concerning the laws of this country and how they would interface with the foreign military there, let me assure everybody here that the Minister of Justice of this country and the Solicitor-General reign supreme over all military at all times and we must abide by these laws. The current power of policing at the federal establishment at Goose Bay is the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and they supersede even my military police that are there, and justice will be sustained at all levels no matter what changes take place.

I would, just on a lighter note, like to mention that a number of groups have got up here today and criticized or questioned the Panel about female participation. I would say, Dr. Barnes, I noted that those who were criticizing did not seem to have a female speaker at the time. So maybe we should keep that in mind.

The Panel has made efforts to do this and all organizations are.

I would like to mention one other thing, the doctor who talked about the Canadian Public Health Association and the health effects on people, we have just participated and, as I say, I have participated under the terms of this Canadian Public Health Association study on the impact of low-flying. I will say that the scenarios involved, and I would suggest that you may wish to take a close look at their report and it may be released to the Panel for their study or inclusion, but some of the scenarios involved flying over a psychologist in a canoe reading a book on a lake with aircraft in excess of 600 miles an hour below 100 feet in altitude. I suppose it was well monitored. There were two or three different media, in fact, one national media, monitoring this and on film, so it will be available to all public to, for once and all, see the results of what is happening and what in actual fact happened there.

I would say that the people who were involved was not just the Public Health people. The wildlife biologists that are studying the caribou herd now which we are forced to participate in -- I should not say forced -- which we are enjoying participating in, and have been asked to participate in, it is very interesting for us, but they had their sound instruments there, too. They were not going to take the word of the Canadian Public Health Association, their scientists were involved, simultaneously. I hope that this information will be available to all the peoples very soon and that we will have a very clinical understanding, then, of exactly what low-flying means and at the different distances from people.

Lastly, I mention for the gentleman about the laundry being sent home. I am informed that the foreign militaries do not ship their laundry home unless it is theirs, they bring in their suitcase and I think that is fair. All of the laundry and all of that type of business at the airport is either tendered to private enterprise through Public Works Canada or through a local laundry business in the area. It is a fairly extensive contract.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colonel David. If somebody would like to ask a question, would you please go to the microphone.

QUESTION FROM MEDIA: Could I have your rank?

COLONEL DAVID: Lieutenant-Colonel John David. I am the Station Commander at Goose Bay and I am responsible for co-ordinating all military flying activities at Goose Bay.

MEDIA: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a gentleman at the back who wishes to ask a question, I believe.

MR. GEOFF CARRE: Recently, our Defence Minister Perrin Beatty was asked a question of whether nuclear weapons might be stationed up there in time of a crisis. Mr. Beatty responded by saying that we have a commitment to NATO.

What you suggested earlier was that nuclear weapons would not be stationed up there as part of a training, as I understand it.

My question to you is: Is it possible that nuclear weapons would be stationed up there?

COLONEL DAVID: First, it requires a long answer to really meet the answer you want but let me tell you, in peacetime, Goose Bay does not have the capability to store nuclear weapons today. The constraints are horrendous on that type of thing and we do not have the capability, first off.

Secondly, it is the policy of the Government of Canada that, under no circumstances, are nuclear weapons and that type of activity to take place in this country today. I believe that, as far as I know, that is the procedure.

There is no requirement under the training scenarios, even the most extensive training scenarios that I know of, where that would even be a criteria or even a remotest possibility.

You see, it is not just a case of being able to have nuclear weapons. The storage and protection of those type of armaments, the environmental criteria and everything else, is so stringent that it would be virtually impossible for us to arrange or even to be able to do today in this country without major, major infrastructure changes.

MR. CARRE: So what you are saying, then, is that it would not be possible to station nuclear weapons up there, definitively.

COLONEL DAVID: Certainly not currently.

Sir, I think that it is important to say that it is possible to do anything anywhere, and in fact, today, even a Cesna 185 or a twin Labrador or helicopter or that type of facility can be used in a time of crisis or that type of event, as example, for a Cruise missile platform. A 747, a Bear aircraft from the Russians, these type of things, any air vehicle today. So the point I am trying to make is that, in peacetime, there are no plans under any circumstances that are available to any person that I know of in Canada where nuclear weapons would be a scenario in this country today.

MR. CARRE: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Colonel David.

Now, if he is ready, we will hear from Mr. Cyril Goodyear.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. CYRIL GOODYEAR:

MR. CYRIL GOODYEAR: Gentlemen, I want to thank you for the opportunity to make a few comments.

First of all, my name is Cyril Goodyear. I am the former Deputy Minister of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am currently at Memorial University, not employed in a departmental capacity. I am there intending to be an academic.

Just to set the tone, my connection with Labrador goes back over 40 years, right after the end of the Second World War when I lived and worked in Labrador as a Newfoundland Ranger, and I have been there in other capacities over a long period of time.

Goodyear, Sub.

So that I have known the scene, the Native scene, as it is believed to be and I know it now.

I just want to make a few comments by way of clarification with respect to the land claims issue which has arisen during the course of the hearings

It seems to me that it is a bit of a red herring or perhaps red fox or whatever the case might be and, while I respect the opinions and the views of all of those who want to present them, as long as they are factual, objective and straightforward, then, I can accept them, whether or not I agree with them.

I am a member of the Land Claims Committee for the Government of Newfoundland. That is a committee of senior officials which advises government and which is set up to both advise and oversee land claims negotiations.

The Government of Newfoundland publicly announced some years ago that it was prepared to negotiate land claims in Labrador with the Inuit and with the Innu and, in fact, preliminary discussions have already begun with the Labrador Inuit Association which has filed a land claim with the federal government. As soon as the federal government straightens out its policy on land claims which, as you know, has been reviewed by the Coolican Task Force, then the Government of Newfoundland will return to the negotiating table with the Labrador Inuit Association.

Goodyear, Sub.

With respect to the Innu people, the Indian people in Labrador represented by the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association, I am not aware that they have made a claim, as such, to both governments. Until a valid proposal is made which can form the basis for negotiation and the desire is expressed to negotiate, then it is very difficult for both governments or either government to talk about active negotiations. But, despite the fact that there has not yet been a comprehensive proposal by the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association to the Government of Canada or to the Government of Newfoundland, the Government of Newfoundland has already publicly expressed its intention to negotiate these claims.

It is my understanding as a member of the Land Claims Committee that any activity which takes place in Labrador is the object of consideration by the Government of Newfoundland or the Government of Canada. So that they will ensure that nothing prejudices the ongoing negotiations and the ultimate settlement of these land claims. So that that is the situation.

I have heard calls today for the negotiation of the land claims and so on. One set of negotiations has already started, at least in the preliminary stages, and as soon as there is a proposal to the government from the Naskapi-Montagnais Innu Association and as soon as it is assessed, then undoubtedly, it will will be scheduled for negotiation.

Goodyear, Sub.

So that is not a real issue as far as your function is concerned because there is a clear public statement of intention to negotiate and, in one case, the preliminary negotiations have already begun. So I just wanted to clarify that particular point for your benefit and since this is a media event, for the benefit of those others who are present.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Goodyear.

With that, then, we have come to the end of the list of scheduled intervenors. We have some time left. We could use that time to hear a few more presentations, spontaneous presentations. We could entertain questions, either to the Panel or to Major McCabe concerning the project or we could end the meeting.

Would anybody like to speak? Yes, sir. Would you kindly give your name?

MR. JOHN HICKEY: John Hickey, Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Mr. Barnes, in front of me I have an environmental assessment panel reviewing military flying activities in Labrador and Quebec, independent, technical experts. We were wondering why or if you have any plans in the future to include some of the technical experts we have in this province?

I notice one name here, Mr. Ian Juniper, and his area of expertise concerns impacts on caribou.

MR. HICKEY: I would just like to inform you, Mr. Barnes and your Panel, that we have what we consider to be an expert in the caribou in Labrador and we were wondering as to why we have not had any input from this province as far as this list of names.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I should explain that what you are holding is a list of names of certain technical experts which have been engaged to support the Panel. They will be engaged on an as needed basis to review documents or to provide advice to the Panel on these technical matters.

We have not finished putting together the full body of experts that we anticipate the Panel will need. We have identified certain needs and we have filled them.

I wonder: Is the person to whom you are referring a person who is resident in Labrador and an expert on caribou? Is that person an employee of the government? Because if he is, he would not qualify to be employed as a technical advisor to the Panel. That is one restriction that we have to observe, that we do not employ as a technical expert for the support of the Panel anyone who is employed by either the federal or the provincial government at the present time.

MR. HICKEY: The point I am making, I think, Mr. Barnes, is that we would like to see input from experts in Labrador and in this province.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Using another subject area, we want to get somebody on line, so to speak, who is knowledgeable about social and economic conditions within Labrador and who can advise us on that. We have so far been unable to obtain the services of anyone who is available when needed by the Panel. We have certainly discussed the possibility with several people who have been suggested to us but, unfortunately, they are not available during the most critical times of this review and, therefore, would not be appropriate to be engaged as experts. We are still looking, we have not stopped, we are still looking for such a person and, certainly, if you would care to suggest or if anyone else would care to suggest experts in certain issues pertinent to this review, we would be only too glad to accept them and consider them.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Barnes.

Just one last point: I understand you are scheduling your schedule to go to the coastal communities, the north coastal communities of Labrador.

THE CHAIRMAN: This week, yes.

MR. HICKEY: Yes. No mention or, at least, none to my knowledge, has been made to the Straits area of Labrador which is also a very vibrant part of our country up there.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have, in fact, visited the Straits area a couple of weeks ago when we were on a circuit through Goose Bay and Cartwright and Mary's Harbour. This was brought to our attention that we had not scheduled a visit to the Straits area and, at the last minute, at the end of that week, we did add on a visit to the community of Forteau as being a central community in that area. So we have, in fact, visited there.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. DAVID THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am David Thompson. I just wanted to make a comment on militarization.

We know that we face a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons and we know that, even on the most rational scenarios, we could not need more than 200 on each side to wipe each other out. Scholars and others always puzzle about why we are in that peculiar situation. There must be a dozen different theories about why the arms race advances.

But one of those theories is that due to economic factors, people get locked into a militarized economy and make decisions on military matters, not for military reasons but for purely economic ones. It does seem to me that Happy Valley-Goose Bay looks like a case study in exactly this because, as the evening has progressed, I have noticed a number of arguments arguing not that NATO happens to need a training base, which it may or may not, I hope you will get a chance to investigate that question, but, rather, that whether or not we need such a training base for military reasons, we should have it for economic reasons because, after all, Happy Valley and Goose Bay are dependent upon military employment.

But that seems to me to be exactly the argument which is used throughout the world, or at least one possible argument that is used throughout the world, for a continuation of the arms race everywhere, not that we need more weapons for military purposes but because, once the spiral starts, there are economic forces which push us towards doing that, whether we need them or not. Once that spiral gets started, it is very hard to get out of it. Once one militarizes a certain area, such as Happy Valley-Goose Bay, as we did, indeed, 20 or 30 years ago, it becomes, as we have seen this evening, very difficult and I have great sympathy for the population of the area who are caught in this bind. It is very difficult to get out of that spiral of trying to promote further employment and further economic recovery by even more military activity.

If you multiply that on a world scale, you get exactly our problem with the arms race. At some point, that spiral has to be broken. I think we should separate the question of the military requirements of this training on the one hand, which I hope the Panel will get a chance to judge on, from the separate question of whether or not we should continue even this minor aspect of the arms race for purely economic reasons.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would somebody else care to speak? One last chance.

Very well, then. I guess the time has come to conclude the meeting.

Thank you to all of you for coming and especially thank you to all of you who have come forward and made presentations to the Panel. Thank you to our Secretariat for their usual good work, to our court reporter, our audio technician and to our hardworking interpreters in the booth at the back of the room.

Thank you very much and good night, everyone.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Volume

14

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	NAIN	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 28, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	14	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO—OTTAWA—WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Nain Community Hall, Nain

DATE: October/octobre 28, 1986.

VOLUME: 14

INDEX

AFTERNOON SESSION:

	PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman	1581
Presentation by Major David McCabe	1592

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Don Dickerson	1606
William Barbour	1607
Dan Jararuse	1612
William Andersen	1614

* * * * *

EVENING SESSION:

Introduction by The Chairman	1618

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Herb Brown	1623
William Andersen	1630
Jerry Sillitt	1656
Joanna Andersen	1659
Barbara Kitowski	1664
Danny Jararuse	1670
Participant from Nain	1671
Abel Leo	1674
William Andersen	1677
John Igloliorte	1680
Rosina Holwell	1683
Julius Merkuratsuk	1685
Tabia Murphy	1687
William Andersen	1696
Judy Rowell	1698
Sharon Edmunds	1702
William Andersen	1704
Barbara Kitowski	1706
Aba Kojak	1709

* * * * *

---Upon commencing at 3:20 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has come to meet with the people of Nain today.

I would like to advise you first that we are providing simultaneous interpretation in Inuktituk and English, and the receivers for this are available over there in the corner, free of charge. You can go and obtain one and then use the headset to listen in the other language, if that is what you prefer.

Before I carry on with the meeting, I would like to invite Mr. Don Dicker to come and say some opening remarks.

MR. JERRY SILLITT: (Prayer in Inuktituk.)

MR. DON DICKER, SENIOR: I would like to officially welcome the Panel to our town and to express how pleased we are that you are able to come to our municipality and listen to the views, opinions and submissions that will be made to the Panel this afternoon and this evening.

I know that the different groups and individuals will have a lot of very interesting things to say and especially concerns that they are going to have in regards to the proposed low level flying, military activity and the proposed NATO base in Goose

Bay.

Thank you.

MR. WILLIAM BARBOUR: Well, to carry on with the Town Council of Nain submission, I would like to carry on with what Donald was saying, that we welcome you here and that I would like to present the Town Council of Nain position right now.

With reference to the Draft Guidelines, we are not going to address them specifically for the following reasons: We and our staff members do not have the expertise nor the time to read and comprehend the document. The document is written in such a way that it cannot be easily understood by the general public. In other words, the language used is too complicated for people who do not have the expertise to interpret it.

MR. DICKER, SR.: Maybe before we go on, I think it is only fair to the people here for the Panel introduce themselves sufficiently to the community people here, and I think that the Panel probably want to have a few words or say something before we actually make submissions to the Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: What we have been doing in other places is introducing the Panel; then saying something about the review and how it is working, what has happened so far and what is going to happen after this; and then, we usually hear something about the project itself and invite questions from the audience on the project.

Would that be a suitable procedure for this occasion or do you want to present the Town Council position at the beginning?

MR. DICKER, SR.: I think since you have done that in other communities, I think it is only fair that the Panel introduce themselves and probably talk about what you have been doing in other communities so we can probably make submissions after you have said what you have to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, then. So we will have the introductory part and then that might take perhaps 45 minutes. Then we could have a break. I believe there is going to be coffee service here and we could talk informally and then come back and start the presentations of the various submissions, starting with the Town Council of Nain.

Would that be all right?

MR. WILLIAM BARBOUR: My apologies for not knowing the procedure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, do not apologize. It is quite all right. There is no problem. Fine. All right.

Well, as I said at the beginning, then, my name is David Barnes. I work for the Government of Canada and I have been appointed the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel.

The Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public review of certain proposed military flying activities proposed by the Department of National Defence, centered at Goose Bay, but involving flying activities extending over parts of Labrador and parts of the Province of Quebec.

I will now introduce the other members of the Panel so you can get to know them better.

Beginning at that end of the table on your left is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. He was stationed for a time at Goose Bay and he brings to this Panel his knowledge of military aircraft and how they operate. Mr. Stewart lives near Ottawa where he operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who has had extensive experience with wildlife in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. He lives in St. John's where he is an official of a company called Northland Associates Limited which is a consulting firm in environmental matters.

I hardly need to introduce the next person. I am sure most of you know him already. Mr. Tim McNeill lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business. Mr. McNeill has been appointed to this Panel because of his knowledge of the culture and the interests and the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

On my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and also in certain commercial activities in Sept Iles. He was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for approximately 20 years before his retirement.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who has worked extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of Northern Quebec. Dr. Wilkinson lives in Montreal where he operates a consulting firm.

I am employed at an office of the Government of Canada in Ottawa called the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. When I am not functioning as the Chairman of this Panel, my ordinary, everyday work is related to my position as Director for the Atlantic Region for that office.

As I said, then, the Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment and given a very important task in that this proposed project could possibly have effects on certain land areas and on certain people living in those lands.

In order to examine the effects that the project may have, this Panel will be asking the Department of National Defence to write a report, a report which we call an Environmental Impact Statement. That report will describe the proposed activities involving military flying and other activities. It will discuss from the point of view of National Defence what effects those activities may have on the environment and on the social and cultural lives of the people who live in certain parts of Labrador and Quebec.

When that report, that Environmental Impact Statement, is delivered to the Panel sometime next year, the Panel will examine it and will make it available also to the public so that people in Nain and people in many other communities can examine it and we will listen to what you think of that document. We will take all of this information from the Environmental Impact Statement, from the public and from many other sources and, at the end of the exercise, at the end of the review, I should say, the Panel will prepare its own report to the Government of Canada in which it will tell the government how it feels about the proposed military activities. The Panel will tell the government about the impacts that the project may have on the environment. It will tell the government whether the Panel feels that those impacts are very serious or not so serious, whether certain things can be done to improve the beneficial impacts from the project, whether things can be done to lessen the seriousness of the harmful impacts that may come from the project and it will provide advice and recommendations to the Government of Canada on whether the project should be allowed to proceed.

Very briefly, what has happened so far is that, in February of 1986, the Department of

National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment, describing the project and saying: Will you please appoint a Panel to conduct a public environmental review of this proposal. The Minister appointed this Panel in July, and one of the first things that the Panel had to do was to begin to prepare a set of instructions to be given to the Department of National Defence to direct them in preparing this Environmental Impact Statement. The Panel has to be sure, in giving those instructions, that all of the important concerns of the various people living in this part of Labrador and Quebec that might be affected, that their concerns are all listed in these instructions, that all these concerns will be examined, that all of the right subjects will be examined, whether they relate to the natural environment, that is, to the water or the wildlife or whether they relate to the way that people live in their communities and how they earn their living and whether these things are going to be affected by the project.

All of those instructions will be contained in a document which is called the Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

A preliminary version, a draft of the Guidelines, was issued by the Panel in August. It was published in English and in French and in certain native languages and has been distributed quite widely to a lot of people.

The Panel has done this because it wants to make sure that it is going to cover all of the proper subject-matter when it gives these Guidelines to the Department of National Defence. So it is asking people like yourselves in many communities what you feel about those Guidelines. Is the document complete? Does it cover all of the right subjects? Is it good enough to serve as the Guidelines to National Defence for them to prepare this Environmental Impact Statement?

In order to hear what you have to say, we are conducting a series of meetings in 17 localities through the months of September and October. We are listening very carefully to everything that is said. Sometimes we receive written briefs; sometimes we receive only oral presentations. Either way is fine because it all goes into the official record of all of these meetings and anyone can obtain a copy of the transcript of any of these meetings just by asking for it any time they wish.

When the meetings are all over at the end of this month, in fact, at the end of this week, the Panel will gather together all of the information coming from the meetings, and in the month of November, the Panel will sit down and look at all of this information and decide how the Guidelines document should be improved and developed into its final form and our intention at the present time is to be able to present the final form of the Guidelines document to the Department of National Defence early in the month of December of this year.

National Defence will then begin to prepare that Environmental Impact Statement which will involve a great deal of work. It will require them to gather information from a great many sources. It may require them to go into communities or out into the country and do certain studies to provide information which is lacking at the present time and it will certainly involve a lot of writing on their part.

It will be a long process. We expect that National Defence may be ready to submit their Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel sometime in 1987, perhaps during the summer.

As I said before, that document will be made available to the public as soon as it is received by the Panel and that will begin a period of review which will extend over several months.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Statement is satisfactory; that is, that the document has met the requirements of the Guidelines, the Panel will then announce another round of meetings which we will call public hearings to discuss the project and to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement.

When those hearings are over, the Panel will then write its own report, which I mentioned before, and at the present time, we would expect that the Panel might be ready to submit that report to the government late in 1987 or perhaps early in 1988.

Now, I would like to go through some of the highlights of the Guidelines document because I imagine that some of you here in the audience may not have had an opportunity to actually see that document.

We have already heard the remark, and I take note of that remark, that the document is written in the sort of language that, perhaps, makes it a little difficult for some people to understand. I appreciate what you mean by that. It is a problem always when you are trying to provide instructions involving scientific subject-matter to write it in a way that it gives clear directions to the person who must follow those instructions and, at the same time, to make it readable for the general public. Perhaps there are things that we can do when we make the document into its final form to make it more understandable.

In the meantime, the document does several things: First of all, it states what is the scope of the review and it points out quite clearly that the review is to examine not only the flying activities, which are perhaps the best-known part of this proposal, but other related activities such as construction which may be carried on at the Goose Bay Airfield, the operations of the airfield, maintenance and continuing right through to the possible close-down of the project.

The Guidelines next gives some instructions to National Defence on how we expect them to go about this work. There are certain established ways that the Panel recognizes are the best ways to carry out Environmental Impact Assessments and the Guidelines gives some instructions to National Defence on those methods which the Panel would prefer to be used.

Perhaps the most important part of the Guidelines is Section 5 which lists the issues, the concerns which the Panel identified up to August of this year.

The issues which the Environmental Impact Statement will have to deal with are so important that I am going to read each one of these for you. There are nine of them.

In listing these nine issues, we point out that this does not have to be the total list. There may be other issues which are being identified in these meetings that we are having now which can be added on to the list; there may be other issues which National Defence may think of themselves that the Panel has not thought of, but this is at least the starting point for the Impact Statement.

The nine subjects or issues are as follows:

(1) The effects of low-flying

aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife;

(2) the effects of low-level military training on subsistence lifestyles and on land use;

(3) the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the project area;

(4) the impacts of the project on commercial activities that are based on renewable resources.

One example of that sort of thing might be the operation of outfitting camps for hunters.

(5) The impacts on the natural environment of, first of all, construction activities associated with the possible expansion of Goose Bay Airport and, secondly, the impacts on the natural environment of exhaust emissions from increased flying activities.

Issue number 6 is the cumulative or combined effects of the project and of other projects and activities which may be already going on in the region or which may be planned to occur during the same time as the project that is under review.

Number 7 is the need for what is called «monitoring»; that is, examining the project as it proceeds, watching over the various activities involved in the project, observing what effects it is having on the environment and comparing those observations with what was predicted to happen.

Number 8, the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges and, finally, the effects that the project may have on the outcome of land claims negotiations between the Government of Canada and certain native groups.

Those, then, are the nine issues that we have identified or, at least, that we had identified up until August of this year.

The final part of the Guidelines gives instructions to National Defence on the format and the layout of the impact statement itself, the order of the subject-matter that we want to appear in there. So that, then, gives you a brief idea of what is contained in the Guidelines document. We would certainly be prepared to answer any questions a little later on the review, on the process, on what we are trying to accomplish.

Now, I mentioned a little while ago that we would hear something about the project itself. In order to make sure that you have a good understanding of what is being proposed and what the Panel is being asked to examine, we have invited here a representative of the Department of National Defence who is going to briefly outline the proposed project and who will be willing to answer any of your questions after he has made his presentation.

So I would like to introduce to you Major David McCabe of the Department of National

Defence. Major McCabe, would you go ahead whenever you are ready.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel Members, ladies and gentlemen of Nain, and I believe some Hopedale representatives, I am going to try and keep my presentation as short as possible and as straight forward as possible. If there are some things particularly about the proposal itself and the kind of activity that people do not really understand, please let me know at the end and I will gladly talk more about them.

I think most of the people of Nain are aware that ever since Goose Bay was built in 1941 as a military base that there has always been a military presence there, although it is varied in its level of activity.

In the mid-60s, the military population and their families was nearly 12,000. At that time, the predominant military was the United States Air Force and there was some presence from the Royal Air Force of Great Britain.

In 1980 the German Air Force, the Air Force of West Germany, became interested in conducting low-level flying at Goose Bay similar to that being done by the British Air Force. Because of the proposed increase in flying at that time, and because of the requirement for what we call a practice weapons range, the Department of National Defence conducted as was required what they call an initial environmental evaluation.

Now, this was done, it is what we call a desk study. It was an examination primarily of existing information, studies relating to such activities that had been done in other parts of the country or, indeed, parts of the world.

It was felt, after this study was done, this evaluation, that the effects of the proposed flying would be negligible on the environment. Because there was a lack of information about the effects of the military-type aircraft on caribou, it was decided to establish a policy of avoidance, that is, whenever there is large concentrations of animals, to try and avoid them as much as possible.

Because of the increase in the flying activity, it became necessary to establish what is called a military co-ordination centre. This was built or set up, if you like, in 1984, and is manned by Canadian Forces personnel. Their main job is to co-ordinate and control all local military flying. Every pilot or air crew that wants to go out and fly a mission in the Labrador training areas has to come and file a flight plan at this co-ordination centre. When that flight plan is filed, the air crew are also advised of any local restrictions that might exist, such as the location of hunting camps or fishing camps, known locations. Also, if it happens to be a migration period, for example, for the caribou or the calving period, areas where the animals are are shown to the pilots and they are told not to fly in those areas.

To give you an idea of how they mark this on the maps, and all the pilots fly with maps, if there is a known camp that is occupied, they mark a red circle around it on their map, about five miles in diameter and they are told to stay away from those camps as far as low flying goes.

At present, there are four military users, as we call them, in Goose Bay. Now, they do different kinds of activity. These four military users in February of this year signed a long-term multi-national agreement, called a Memorandum of Understanding. This agreement basically covers and provides for all military activity in Goose Bay.

The countries that have signed that are Canada, United States, Great Britain and West Germany.

The United States has a very small group of people in Goose Bay, only about 16, and their main job is to look after their aircraft that come through, the great big transport aircraft that are bringing supplies to and from Europe. They often stop in Goose Bay to re-fuel and that is their primary job, is to service those aircraft.

The Canadian Forces really do not do much flying there, particularly with jets. Their main job is to look after the long-range radar which has been in Goose Bay for many years. They also look after the air traffic control radar facility. I mentioned the military co-ordination centre. Something that is new for the Canadian Forces as of March of this year, what we call a station rescue flight was established in Goose Bay.

Now, that rescue flight has three rescue helicopters which are based in Goose Bay permanently. In previous years, they used to come in just during the summer. Now, these three helicopters are there year-round.

In 1988 the Canadian Forces will establish a small detachment of the new CF-18 fighters in Goose Bay. Their main job will be to look after air defence purposes, if you like. The old Voodoo aircraft used to do that.

The Royal Air Force has been, as I mentioned earlier, mainly doing low level flying. They used to fly the great big Vulcan bombers. They have now replaced that with a new aircraft, a smaller one, called the Tornado. This year, the Royal Air Force had nine of these aircraft in Goose Bay during the flying season. That is the first time they have done that. In the past, they have always brought aircraft in and out. This year they kept them there and moved the people around.

The Germans also do low level flying. They usually have about 20 aircraft and they vary in their types.

The kind of training these two countries do, I mentioned low level flying, it is basically to train them how to fly at a very low level and how to navigate and carry out basic, what we call, tactical maneuvering.

They do this, the majority of this flying, at very low level in two designated low level training areas and those are marked on a map behind me on on the wall which people can look at if they wish.

Sometimes the aircraft will also use the practice weapons range that I mentioned earlier. We only have one; it is in the southern training area and it is about eight miles in diameter, or 13 kilometres, and it is located in an open, sandy area that was previously burned out in a forest fire.

Now, the kind of weapons they use on this practice range are what we call non-explosive and non-contaminant devices. All they are, they look like real bombs, they are usually made of metal or concrete or plastic. So, when these things are dropped in this area, there are no explosives or anything like that.

In mentioning that explosive business I want to state clearly that there are no plans at this time to use that range, that practice range, with any live weapons.

As the Chairman mentioned earlier, there are two proposals that the Department of National Defence is asking to be examined here. One of them is an expansion of the activity that is going on now and by an expansion, I mean the current users have indicated a desire to put some more aircraft in and maybe fly a little longer training season which, right now, runs from about March to the end of October.

As well, some other countries have indicated an interest in conducting similar training at Goose Bay. The Government of Canada is currently talking with the Government of the Netherlands, or Holland as it is sometimes called. It is hoped that the Royal Netherlands Air Force will conduct a half-season program in 1987, using about 10 to 12 F-16 aircraft and about 120 people.

This proposal will still concentrate mostly on low flying activity.

The other proposal that I want to talk about, and this one maybe is a little more difficult to understand in a way, because it is a proposal. It is something that has been talked about and some things have been written about it but there are no detailed plans for it. It is early in the stage, too early in the stage, to have that kind of detail, but I can tell you a little bit about what we believe will be done at this. It is called the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre and that is just a fancy name for a flying school, if you like, a training school, for pilots where they can practice certain kinds of military activities with their aircraft.

The reason this is being examined, if you like, or is being proposed by NATO, which are the countries of Western Europe that are in the Alliance, is that the countries of Europe are extremely densely populated. Each country has its own air force, its own military, and they have a very large number of aircraft. The number of training areas is very limited and, in this day and age, one kind of training they particularly need a lot of is low level flying. There are also other types of training that are needed.

To give you an example of the problems there, the country of West Germany where a great deal of this flying training occurs has a population of 63 million people in it. That country is about two-thirds the size of Labrador.

Each year, about 538,000 flights are flown by military aircraft, day and night, over West Germany. Of those, about 110,000 are low level. So they have some problems with that.

Also, the suitable training areas where they can carry out beneficial training are very limited in number. So each country has each year a lot of shortfalls, they are not able to get the training they need.

So NATO decided in about 1981 to start examining the feasibility of building a great, big centre that could handle all the kind of training that all the NATO countries needed.

Now, a group was set up, a working group, and they talked to each of the nations to find out what kind of training they needed, how many flights, et cetera, and they came up with a basic plan, if you like, the scope of a facility that could handle all of these requirements. That was submitted in 1983 in what they call a Phase I report, which was at the end of their first phase of this study.

Two countries have offered locations as potential sites for the Centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and the country of Turkey has offered an air base by the name of Konya.

Before I go into the kind of training, just let me talk a little bit about the scheduling here, the timing.

The working group that I mentioned examined both locations and wrote up a report on each place and they have submitted a recommendation to NATO, a recommendation for what they feel is the most suitable site for this project. NATO should make a decision by December of this year as to whether they accept that recommendation or whether they want to change it or whatever.

Now, when that decision is made, they will enter the final phase of this program and that is, over the next two years, the country that is selected will sit down and negotiate an agreement and will also spend that time designing and planning the scope of this Centre.

Now, one of the things that is very much going to affect the design of this facility will be the results of environmental studies that are currently being done right now and also the results of this Environmental Assessment Panel.

To give you an idea of the level of activity we are talking about here, in its biggest scale, which is really what they have looked at, in the ideal facility, they are talking about up to 136 aircraft flying up to 200 sorties a day for 20 two-week detachments each year, or for about 40 weeks of the year.

During each 2-week detachment, about 1500 people would come to Goose Bay to train. Now, this would involve air crew and the people that look after the airplanes, the ground personnel. To support them and their training, there would be about 1700 people, multi-national, living at the base and they would be there for two or three years at a time and, because of that, they would probably bring their families along. So we could see an extra increase there of maybe 1000 or 1500 people. So, overall, we are looking at a fair number of people possibly coming into the area.

The kinds of facilities that would be needed to support all this activity would require the construction of houses, barracks for single people or unaccompanied people, hangars, operations centres, warehouses, and stores to provide goods to the people, recreational facilities.

Included in the initial construction or establishment of the Centre would be a requirement to upgrade the existing airfield facilities, such as the construction of a parallel runway and also upgrading the re-fuelling system.

Because of the level of activity of this Centre, there would have to be a fairly regular, reliable, re-supply system established. Now, that might mean extending the shipping season into Lake Melville or possibly an expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway which is being constructed right now.

I would like to give you just a little bit of an idea of the kinds of activity that would take place at this Centre, as it is seen in the full scale aspect of this.

There would be a little bit more of the kind of flying that is done right now, low level flying, navigation and reconaissance. There would also be what we call air combat training, which would use a computerized system, an instrumented system, and this would take place mostly in the medium- to high-level altitudes and would also involve supersonic flight as well.

There would be a requirements for electronic warfare training which uses equipment both on the aircraft and on the ground to practice techniques with that.

There would be a requirement for up

to four of the practice weapons ranges, the type that already exist right now.

As well, the report has identified a requirement for up to three live weapons ranges.

One of the desirable or optional items that they would like to have, if it is possible, is what we call tactical air support of maritime operations and all that means is an anti-shipping facility where aircraft would go and practice maneuvers against military shipping, naval shipping.

Usually, this is done in a designated area, in the ocean. Sometimes there would be a requirement for the aircraft to fire weapons, either guns or rockets, at a target that is towed behind one of the ships. We already have, in Canada, off the coasts of Canada and the United States, several of these ranges. Sometimes they are known as sea ranges.

I mentioned the live weapons range. Since 1981, when they first designed or came up with the requirements for this facility, technology has advanced to the stage that, today, we have a computerized system which enables an aircraft to carry out a full attack against a target on the ground and to get accurate scoring from that attack without any weapons coming off the aircraft. So it is a simulated system. It is called a no-drop bomb scoring system and it has some obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment, because no weapons land on the ground. As well, they can save a lot of money, again because they do not have to pay for extra weapons to be dropped.

It is quite likely that this kind of an operation, this kind of equipment, would be established in the NATO Centre. Should there still be a requirement to have a live weapons range, again it would be a very small one, and there are very, very stringent requirements to establish a range like this. They are very closely monitored; we have several of them in Canada and they are cleaned up; any unexploded weapons in there are taken care of on a regular basis.

One of the last things I want to talk about, obviously of interest to a lot of the communities that are in the area, are what we call socio-economic impacts; basically the kind of effect of job-creation or moneys that this kind of activity might generate.

The thing that has to be kept in mind here is that, as I mentioned before, particularly with a NATO project, it is a proposal, it is an idea. We do not know yet exactly how big it would be. Therefore, it is difficult to say exactly how many jobs would be created, for example. The Department of National Defence is just finishing a study where they are examining both the increased current activity and also the NATO proposal and they are coming up with some ideas about possible job types and numbers that might come out of this kind of activity.

With respect to employment opportunities, particularly, this would fall into two phases: One would be the initial construction; all of those buildings and upgrading that I talked about would require, obviously, a lot of employment. As well, once the facility was built, then there would be maybe different kinds of jobs which would be required for the regular operational phase of this.

During its survey last year, the working group looked at a few locations where they might want to upgrade facilities to serve as alternate airfields, as we call them.

Now, in any flying operation, an alternate airfield is needed in case an aircraft has an emergency or in case he has to go there, due to bad weather at the place that he took off from. The working group has looked at the possibility of Wabush, Churchill Falls or Schefferville as prospective sites.

If one of those or a couple of them were selected, then they would require also a little bit of construction, possibly lengthening runways and establishing re-fuelling systems.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the expanded programs that we are talking about, that we are asking to be examined, particularly the NATO one, is very much a proposal. There is not at present any funding that is identified for that NATO project. As they go through the next two years of planning, et cetera, then that is when they will try and identify where funding might come from.

Obviously, as I think everyone is probably aware, all countries of the world are going through times of economic cutbacks and a lot of trimming down of programs. Military programs are not exempt. We are included in those. So, when they sit down and design the actual scope or size of this thing, it may well end up being somewhat reduced from its original proposal.

Once that planning takes place and once we have a little more idea about the expansion of the current activity, then we will have a clearer idea of exactly what is in store for the future of military flying in Goose Bay and in Labrador.

That really concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I would certainly be happy to take any questions about my presentation or about the proposals.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe. I would like to thank all of you in the audience for being patient through a lengthy presentation. I believe that it is worth spending some time to make sure that we all understand what the project is and how we are trying to carry out this review.

I would like to take, perhaps, two or three minutes for a couple of questions to Major McCabe, if anybody would like him to explain a little more any of the things that he has mentioned in his presentation or if you have any other question, just about the military activities at the present time.

Would anybody like to ask a question?

Well, if not, then thank you again, Major McCabe. I would like to call a break in the meeting of five minutes, after which we will come back and we will hear the presentation from the Community Council of Nain.

Thank you.

---Short recess

---Upon resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: We will continue with the meeting now, please.

We will go on now with the presentation from the Community Council of Nain. So I would ask the speakers to make themselves comfortable at the table and would you please give your names for the record before you begin.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DON DICKER, SENIOR:

MR. DON DICKER, SENIOR: My name is Don Dicker, Senior. I am the Mayor of Nain, and to my right is William Barbour who is the Deputy Mayor of Nain.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say how pleased we are to have the opportunity to make a submission to your Panel in our municipality on activity which is already having an effect on Nain and its surrounding areas.

Our submission is in no way to be interpreted as representative of the opinions or position of the residents of Nain, as we have made no specific effort to date to seek their opinions. What our submission does is reflect the views of six individual councillors, elected by their fellow residents, to govern their municipality.

If the military activity was or is to be within close proximity to our town, the Council would certainly take a more active role in seeking the communitys opinions on the potential environmental and social effects of such activity.

At this time, I would like to turn the submission over to my Deputy Mayor who will present it to the Panel.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WILLIAM BARBOUR:

MR. WILLIAM BARBOUR: Thank you, Mayor.

As I started the submission earlier, I would just like to re-read what I had said earlier.

With reference to the Draft Guidelines, we are not going to address them specifically for the following reasons:

We and our staff members do not have the expertise, nor the time, to read and comprehend the document and the document is written in such a way that it cannot be easily understood by the general public. In other words, the language used is too complicated for people who do not have the expertise to interpret it.

Barbour, Sub.

What we have decided to do with the Panel's permission is to tell you what we see are the positive and negative aspects of the expansion of Happy Valley-Goose Bay as a centre for low level flight training, tactical fighter weapons training and NATO air forces training.

We believe the positives concerning military flying activities in general in Labrador will create employment for people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay who are already qualified for jobs related to the proposed activities and provide business expansion opportunities in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area.

We believe the following points to be negative concerning military flying actvities in general in Labrador:

It is believed that most people in Nain are opposed to it. It is a fact that military are already straying from their training areas and are flying over bays and rivers in close proximity to Nain. Such activities seem to be explained as sightseeing tours by military personnel.

These activities and the explanation for them are not appreciated. Those people not living in the area will not benefit from the expansion of Happy Valley-Goose Bay unless they move to the area and are lucky enough to obtain a job.

Air and noise pollution will affect the environment. There is possibility that the safety of domestic air traffic, both in Happy Valley-

Barbour, Sub.

Goose Bay and flight routes in Labrador will be in jeopardy.

Low level flight training in the proposed areas, these we feel are negative aspects. Jets go too close to the ground and lakes, affecting people who are out on the land. Jets are straying from their flight routes and flying over communities. The effects the flights will have on wildlife and vegetation are questionable. Pollution from exhaust emissions, release of fuel in flight and noise levels will affect the environment, wildlife, people, et cetera. Plane crashes could possibly increase.

Expansion of flight training areas is a possibility. These low level flights could possibly affect the caribou herds in Labrador.

In the Nain and surrounding areas, this low level flight training will be a concern to many people who still depend on hunting, trapping and fishing as part of or their whole way of life.

The effects on wildlife in general are unknown. Noise and air pollution, again, are a possibility. Bird-nesting areas could be affected. Wildlife could be driven away from the area.

It is felt that such activity is not wanted in Nain and surrounding areas.

With regards to the weapons ranges, we feel that it would be a negative aspect, being that chemicals used to defoliate the ranges will affect wildlife also. Pollution will affect the ecosystem.

Barbour, Sub.

The activity will spoil the land and it is felt such ranges are not wanted in Nain and surrounding areas.

Live weapons storage areas in Labrador could be under attack in the event of war.

With regards to training ranges, it is felt such ranges are not wanted in Nain and surrounding areas. Sea training will undoubtedly be held north of Nain, possibly in the Saglek area, which is used by Nain residents for hunting and fishing. Again, plane crashes are a possibility.

Wildlife habitat will also be encroached upon.

With regards to NATO Air Forces Training Centre, we feel that more areas of Labrador will be needed than presently proposed. There will be more daily low level flights. All of northern Labrador could eventually be used for their activities.

Labrador will be much more in the minds of potential enemies. In the event of world war, the NATO base will be a number one target for our enemies.

To finalize our submission, we believe there is a need for a comprehensive study to be carried out on the effects that low level flight training and tactical fighter weapons training and NATO Air Force training will have on human population, whether in established communities or in their traditional hunting, trapping and fishing grounds. Fresh water courses, flora, all fur-bearing animals and their habitat, game calving areas, small and big game, fish spawning grounds, fresh water fish, sea mammals, salt water fish and other marine life, migratory birds, sea birds, land birds, studies should be carried out not only in the proposed areas for the training activities but also in the areas surrounding them.

In July of this year, the combined Councils of Labrador were advised of a stand taken by the Town Council of Nain and we make the same statement to this Panel. The Town Council of Nain is not willing to support or reject the development of Happy Valley-Goose Bay as a NATO base and/or low level flying and tactical weapons training centre until such time as an Environmental Assessment Review Study has been completed by the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. We trust that the studies to be undertaken will include all the issues addressed to you today.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen. We sincerely appreciate the presentation. Although you have said that you have not been able to understand the Guidelines sufficiently to give us specific comments on particular sections, you have, nevertheless, given us a lot of good information here which the Panel will be able to use when it meets to prepare the final form of the Guidelines. So I thank you very much.

I believe that we are next to hear

a presentation from the Hopedale Community Council. Are the representatives of that Council ready to make their presentation?

Does anyone know anything of the whereabouts of those people? Yes, sir? Would you like to speak into the microphone, please? Are you from the Hopedale Council, sir?

MR. DAN JARARUSE: No, I just want to read this from the Community Council from Hopedale.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Would you like to go to the table and sit down, please?

MR. JARARUSE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make yourself comfortable. Would you give us your name, please?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DAN JARARUSE:

MR. DAN JARARUSE: I am Dan Jararuse from Hopedale.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. JARARUSE: We had a letter from Frank Sillett concerning low level flying. He could not attend this meeting, so he wrote this letter and I am going to read it out now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

MR. JARARUSE: I am strongly against low level flying in the North Coast. I feel it affect the behaviour of our wildlife which affects the Native and Settlers' lifestyles. If they do have low level flying in the areas put aside for those exercises only, I have nothing against this at all. People do need employment in Labrador and it would create a few jobs.

I feel regulations should be put in, so fines and imprisonment will deter people from passing areas put aside for low-level flying and this regulation policy should insure that the wildlife is not disturbed. Remember: Labrador is one of the last frontiers and too much change is bad for the wildlife and also the Native people. Even now, there is too much activity going on in our wilderness areas, which is having a drastic change in the wildlife behaviour, also killing much of the wildlife, destroying our very land use live on. I am sure we need technology to come to Labrador North. But let them know we we want to use it, not vice-versa.

As we all know, most of North America was abundant with wildlife at one time. Let us govern our life and also our wildlife. With the help of resource people, natives and settlers, I feel we can come up with good plans to conserve our wildlife.

Frank Sillett, Community Council of Hopedale.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. I wonder if I could ask you if you would be able to lend that letter to the Panel for a few minutes or for perhaps an hour or two so that we can make photocopies of it to give to the Panel members.

MR. JARARUSE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would that be all right?

MR. JARARUSE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if you would give it to the gentleman sitting at the wall behind you, please. Thank you very much. We will get it back to you shortly.

Is there anybody else from the community of Hopedale who would like to say anything at this time? Would you give just for the record, please?

8A

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN:

MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN: My name is William Andersen, President of the Labrador Inuit Association.

Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of comments I would like to make.

I think it is really sad that the Panel, for one thing, is not travelling to the community of Hopedale and the community of Postville. Just for the record, I think the Panel should advise the Department of Environment and DND that those two communities are also in the major impact area of the proposed military activities. Therefore, I would ask that, not because we are dissatisfied with sending representation to other communities from a different community, but so that the individuals as well as the groups in the community have an opportunity to have some input into these hearings.

Andersen, Sub.

The other question I would like to raise is the issues that you raised from 1 to 9. I am surprised that, on number 1, you have effects of low level flying and the noise on humans and wildlife. Are you specifying that humans and wildlife in Labrador are no different? Should there not be two separate studies? Or is the government taking the view that humans in Labrador are no different than wild animals?

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will respond to both of your points, sir.

On the matter of the Panel not visiting the communities of Hopedale and Postville, there was a letter received in the office to that effect and what I have tried to explain in responding to that -- and I think I have said this in some of our earlier meetings, too -- is that the Panel had to make a decision very early on as to where it was going to go and hold these meetings and, if you look at the entire area of Labrador and all of the communities there, and if you look at the parts of the Province of Quebec in which one might imagine there could be effects coming from this project, you could add up a total of well over 30 communities.

The Panel feels that it was simply not possible and practical to think of going to visit each and every one of those communities. So what we have tried to do is look at the various populations of people living in all of these areas and to try to select communities which would best represent those various peoples.

In doing so, we have asked for advice from certain people. We have used the expertise of the members of the Panel themselves and the certain advisors that we have had to try to pick out the most suitable communities and we have chosen 17 which, in itself, is quite a large number of places for the Panel to go.

Where we became aware that there might be people in other communities which we did not plan to visit who might want to say something to the Panel, or meet with the Panel, we made the offer as an alternative to going to the communities, of paying the expenses of a few people from those communities coming into the larger centres where we were going to visit and to meet the Panel here.

I guess we understood from the beginning that we would not be pleasing everybody in going that way but, given the large number of communities in total in the area, it was just not possible to go everywhere.

I guess the best we can do is apologize to those communities that we are not able to visit at this time and when the time comes to schedule another round of meetings, we will consider very carefully where the greatest interest in the project seems to be and to plan our visits in accordance with that.

With regard to your question about the issue number 1 in the Draft Guidelines document, I am sure that the problem comes from the wording that we have chosen to use there. Perhaps we could have worded it differently.

We certainly do not intend to place wildlife and people on equal status there from the point of view of having the studies done, although, certainly, the effects of noise on wildlife may be very important, if there are effects, and if, as a result of that, the lives of people are also affected. But our intention here is that there would be separate studies done on the effects of aircraft noise on humans and the effects of aircraft noise on wildlife. So we are sorry if the wording that we chose to use gave the wrong impression and we will take note of your concern and we will try to word that better in the final form of the Guidelines.

We are very close to five o'clock now, which is the time when we planned to end the afternoon session. So, if it is acceptable to everyone, I would like to adjourn the meeting at this time and we will begin again at seven o'clock. Is that all right with everyone?

Very good, then. Well, thank you very much for coming and we hope we will see you back here again this evening at seven o'clock.

---Dinner adjournment

---Upon resuming at 7:20 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, if I could have your attention for a moment, what was just said was to remind people who were here, or to advise people who are here this evening and were not here this afternoon that we are providing simultaneous interpretation and that receivers are available over at the side of the room.

Ladies and gentlemen, good evening, and thank you for coming to the second part of our meeting here in Nain.

For the benefit of those who were not present this afternoon, I will repeat a few of the things that we said this afternoon.

First of all, my name is David Barnes. I am employed by the Government of Canada and I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment to conduct a public environmental review of certain proposed military flying activities based at Goose Bay and involving flying exercises over parts of Labrador and parts of the Province of Quebec.

I would like to introduce the other members of the Panel. Beginning at the end of the table at your left, that way, is Mr. Don Stewart, a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. Mr. Stewart lives near Ottawa and operates a small farm. He brings to the Panel his expertise in military aircraft and their operations.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott, a biologist who lives in St. John's, and who has extensive experience with wildlife and, particularly, caribou in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Next to him is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business and the Panel hopes to benefit from his particular knowledge of the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

At my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in certain commercial enterprises in Sept-Iles.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson, a biologist who lives in Montreal where he operates a consulting firm. Dr. Wilkinson has worked extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of Northern Quebec and has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis.

I am employed in the Federal Environmental Review Office in Ottawa where I am Director for the Atlantic Region.

The Panel has come to Nain today to hear, in particular, from the people of Nain but, also from the people of Hopedale, to hear what you feel and what you think about a draft document which the Panel published in August of this year.

That document, which is called the

Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, will serve as the instructions that the Panel will give to the Department of National Defence to prepare that impact statement which will be one of the most important documents in this review.

The Panel is asking for the opinions of people in Nain, and in the other communities that we have been visiting, so that we may make that document as good as it can possibly be because the success of this review will depend, in large measure, on, first of all, how good the Guidelines are and, secondly, how well those Guidelines are followed by the Department of National Defence.

This review began in February of this year when the Department of National Defence asked the Minister of Environment to undertake this review. We are at the very important stage now of deciding what subjects, what issues, are going to be examined in this review and, in the month of December, the Panel will present the Guidelines in their final form to National Defence. They will then begin to prepare the impact statement which, we expect, will be ready to be presented to the Panel sometime in 1987, perhaps during the summer.

When the document is received by the Panel, it will be distributed to the public, it will be available to anyone who wishes to see it, and will then be reviewed by the Panel, by various departments of government and, we hope, by the public.

At the end of that review period, there will be public hearings held by this Panel to discuss the project and to discuss the Environmental Impact Statement.

When the hearings are over, this Panel will prepare its own report to the Government of Canada concerning the project, concerning the environmental effects which the Panel expects to see coming from the project, and containing advice to the government on whether or not the project should be allowed to go ahead and under what conditions.

We expect that the report of the Panel may be ready to be presented to the government late in 1987 or early in 1988. That gives you, then, a quick outline of the procedure that the Panel is following in this review.

This afternoon, we heard a presentation from a representative of the Department of National Defence, outlining the project.

Very briefly, the Panel is considering this project to have two parts: (1), the low level flying activity which has been ongoing now for several years over parts of Labrador and Quebec, and the possible expansion of that activity by the Government of Canada, undertaking agreements with additional member countries of NATO, that is the first part of the project.

The second part is the proposal to establish at Goose Bay a tactical fighter weapons training centre for NATO, which would involve, not only low level flying activities, but some other things as well.

Now, we do not intend to go through that presentation again this evening but, if anyone would care to ask questions a little later on about exactly what the project is or if you would like some clarification on what the process is, this review process that the Panel is conducting, we would be very pleased to hear your questions and to try to answer them.

For now, I think we should continue on from where we left off this afternoon and hear from the other speakers that we have on our schedule.

I expect that we may have some time left over after we hear from those speakers. So, if anyone else would like to speak to us here tonight, and if you have not already given your name to the Secretariat which works for the Panel, I would encourage you to do so. We have come a long distance -- I have said this before in other places -- we have come a long distance to hear from you. So, by all means, let us hear from you before we go away, because it may be some time before we get back here again.

In order for you to give your name to somebody, I will ask the two members of the Secretariat to stand and identify themselves when I tell you their names.

First of all, Mr. Michel Bourgon.

Michel, are you here? Very well, then. We still have the other member here.

Mr. Jim Clarke over there at the side wall. So see Jim if you wish to speak to us tonight. Thank you.

We will now proceed with the next speaker, then, Mr. Herb Brown. Are you here, Mr. Brown?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. HERB BROWN:

MR. HERB BROWN: Thank you, Panel. My name is Herb Brown. I am a parent in Nain. I am a teacher and on-the-land instructor and also a Goose Bay homeowner.

I thought that I should start, while I studied this document carefully, it was free for the asking and so I sent away and it was sent to me by the FEARO office, the first thing I wanted to mention -- and all of you have the copies -- regarding the terms and definitions on pages 1 to 3. So, if any of you have the White Paper there, terms and definitions, pages 1 to 3, the Panel does not define what is meant by the terms «native» and «non-native» as far as I could see, the terms that were used on various pages, page 27, among other pages.

Are «natives» the Aboriginal people or, as Mr. McGraw suggested in the Goose Bay areas on October 2nd, 1986, are «natives» a native of Labrador maybe a CFA, «come from away», who has been in Labrador for nine years, as Mr. McGrath

Brown, Sub.

suggested?

Is a relative newcomer to Labrador afforded the same status as Labrador's aboriginal or native-born residents?

Am I, a resident of Labrador for the past ten years, a native? Are my aspirations, as seen on page 27 in this draft document, are my aspirations as a ten-year resident in Labrador as important as an Innu or Inuit person who has lived in harmony with his environment for hundreds of years?

Mr. McGrath was suggesting that that was the case.

How can this be important, you may ask.

The significance here is in the fact that the aspirations and the values of many groups may be lumped together and people like the Innu and the Inuit, with their concerns, may not be given their due. Their concerns may be swept under the carpet, I am afraid, in this process.

The political and economic interests of the Goose Bay business people and politicians are given as much status if they are considered as native Labradorians in this NATO-base decision, perhaps even more so, although their numbers may be equal to or fewer than those of truly native Labradorian ancestry.

It must be very discouraging and angering at times for the Aboriginal, native-born Labradorians who oppose the present low level training

Brown, Sub.

and the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre to be told by people like Mr. Crosbie and Goose Bay entrepreneurs that 98 per cent of Labradorians want these things.

When was a vote taken or a plebiscite held that asked all Labradorians if they were in favour of Labrador being used in this way?

Regarding the scope of the Environmental Impact Study, pages 7(a), 7 on the bottom of the page, and 8(b) and (c), firstly, I have difficulty with this Panel's mandates. Fighter jets have been screaming very low over large parts of Labrador for six years now. I have seen very little in the way of studies that show the impact of low level flying on people, plants and animals.

How can the proponent, the military and government, in the future, minimize any adverse impact, as is stated in the Draft Guidelines when so few studies have been done to determine the adverse impacts?

I suggest to you that the present Innu opposition is testimony to this Panel of six years of adverse impacts on a people.

Secondly, the decision about the tactical fighter weapons training centre will likely be made before this Panel has made its final copy of the Guidelines for the military -- for the proponent -- never mind the final draft of the Environmental Impact Statement. Goose Bay may not get this NATO base

Brown, Sub.

but it will not be because politicians and business people did not try.

Ottawa and St. John's have been behind this proposal from day one. What giants the small people, the Labradorians who are opposed, have had to take on.

Then to top it all off, we are told that Goose Bay politicians and business people should not worry, regardless of the late-1986 decision about the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. With new bilateral agreements already signed and more in the signing stages, there will most likely be an increase of low level flight training anyway. This must make concerned Labradorians rest a lot easier.

No, I must join the growing number of people that are saying the Panel must review its mandate and recommend whether or not present low level flight training should proceed, whether it has been asked to or not.

Page 9, regarding the «organizing and conducting of ecological impact studies» and, page 13, «the cumulative effects of the project», for six years low-level flights have been done over Labrador, for five months of the year. Now the proponent is finally required to do an environmental impact study and we are told it may have to look elsewhere for data -- that is on the bottom of page 12 -- data, I suggest, that could have already been gathered in Labrador. As I already mentioned, there are already

Brown, Sub.

obvious cumulative effects of the earlier component; that is, the low level flight training project that has been going on for six years, if the Panel will only examine them and act on what they find.

Page 26 and 27 states, and I quote:

> «The proponent should document the present state of the environment and it must pay attention to the dynamics of the ecosystem in question, giving particular attention to the relationship between the practice economies and the viability of cultures»,

page 27.

If all this is done by the proponent, it will be the first time that the environment and ecosystems will have been described by the proponent as anything other than a barren, desolate, uninhabited wasteland.

Labrador, with its remarkably beautiful variety of tundra and wooded valleys and water courses, is anything but barren. To the Labrador people who are living in harmony with the land, that is.

I might add, as someone who has taken students off on the land for five or six years, I have found this to be true myself. I have seldom seen more beautiful places than I have seen in Labrador. I am including the parts that are being overflown by

Brown, Sub.

the jets.

As Frank Sillett of Hopedale has so well put it, Labrador is one of the last frontiers and I might add, it is one of the world's last wild, beautiful and unspoiled wilderness areas. Some of us would like it to stay that way.

From page 13 and page 19, regarding the effects of low-flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife and regarding the present low-level flying, the proponent has taken pains to show Labrador people, with maps, such as I see behind me, that they would not be overflying Labrador communities, such as ours. Commercial flight zones would not be overflown, would not be used by the low-flying jets, and permanent hunting and fishing camps would not be overflown.

Repeatedly, these planes have violated the promises that we were given, the assurances that we were given, and, especially since they were given. Seven days after the September 23rd meeting here in this hall last fall, a Phantom jet came over Nain from north to south, low over both the hills. On September 5th of this year, I was buzzed by three waves of jets while fishing in the Fraser River, 50 kilometres northwest of Nain, as you can see from the letter you have with you to Lieutenant-Colonel John David which outlines this in more detail.

I was told by the Inuit fisherman who were camped there that this was a common occurrence.

Brown, Sub.

Others have encountered these jets by Rhodes Island, just northeast within sight, northeast of Nain, off Nain Bay and the three bays, Anaktalik, Anaktalok and Voisey Bay, south of Nain. All of these areas are 50 to 100 kilometres north and east of the established low-flying training zones.

Having been myself frightened and angered by these low-flying planes invading a beautiful and quiet place, I have a great deal of mistrust for anything that the proponent might say. I can understand more fully the mistrust that some native Labradorians feel and the terror that these screaming jets must strike in the heart of people in their canoes or camps.

Do Labrador people who do not want this intrusion or the caribou or the geese who cannot speak for themselves and who may well be adversely affected or a quietly beautiful environment, do these have any say in these projects?

Experience has shown us that the answer is likely "No".

I thank you for the opportunity to say these things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Brown.

The next presentation will be from the Labrador Inuit Association. If the representatives are ready, I would invite them to come up to the table and make their presentation.

---SUBMISSION BY WILLIAM ANDERSEN:

MR. ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will do both documents in both languages myself but maybe it might take a little bit too long in that way, because there might be other people here who would wish to speak. I will try and take it slow and try and read this in English so that I can understand it properly.

I am here tonight to deliver a statement for the record. LIA has prepared a written submission that has three parts to it. The first part I will deliver to the Panel tonight and it will deal with the process and prejudice that it creates for LIA.

Part II deals with general comments on the Guidelines and Part III deals with specific comments on the Guidelines. Our intention at this time is to submit Part II Rigolet and Part III in Makkovik. However, depending on how things go at this meeting, LIA may decide that such level of participation is not worth our effort.

Part I: On behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association, I would like to welcome the Panel members and the Panel Secretariat to Nain.

While this is our first appearance before you, apart from legal counsel addressing you in Wabush, it comes after almost two months of correspondence and negotiations between LIA and the

Andersen, Sub.

Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office over our concerns about the process. This correspondence and the negotiations have been kept confidential in an effort to resolve the outstanding concerns as expeditiously as possible. However, we wish to make this a matter of public record now because it has, and it will continue, to determine LIA's position with respect to this EARP.

The Process as it Prejudices Labrador Inuit:

LIA was pleased when the Minister of Environment announced an EARP for low level flying. We had been asking for an EARP for many years. We wanted an EARP because we believed that it provided us with a forum for dealing with the issues and the impacts. However, LIA believes that, in setting up this EARP Panel, the Department of Environment has violated the integrity of the process to the extent that LIA has serious doubts about the true value of this EARP.

LIA's doubts are for the following reasons -- reasons that the Federal Environment Assessment and Review Office of the Department of Environment already know but which we wish to summarize for the record. LIA believes that the Memorandum of Understanding and the Terms of Reference for the Panel designed to incorporate the requirements of Section 23 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and to eliminate the need for two separate

Andersen, Sub.

reviews, one in Quebec and one in Labrador, prejudice Labrador Inuit.

The project under review has the potential to impact on a vast area of Canada, including a number of provincial and regional administrative jurisdictions. We believe that the most important environmental components and the most significant environmental impacts are and will be in Labrador. The Terms of Reference, however, give primacy to the administration of only one of the regions that may be impacted, namely, the region lying north of 55 degrees parallel in Quebec, as defined in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, the JBNQA.

The principles set out in the JBNQA require that a number of special considerations and preferences be accorded to the Inuit, Crees and Naskapis in Quebec. The impact assessment process under that agreement governs such things as the contents of Environmental and Social Impact Statements and provides very clear preference to the Quebec Inuit, Naskapis and Crees in the review process. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Kativik Regional Government and the Department of Environment, signed the 2nd of July, 1986, have expanded the territorial rights of the JBNQA in a manner that favours and benefits the Quebec Inuit, Naskapis and Crees to the prejudice of other people, including Labrador Inuit.

Labrador Inuit have rights and interests

Andersen, Sub.

in that part of Northern Quebec that is governed by Section 23 of the JBNQA, but those rights and interests are nowhere recognized in Section 23 or in the Memorandum of Understanding or in the Terms of Reference. This is not only prejudicial to the Labrador Inuit but, also, contradicts the spirit and intent of negotiations currently ongoing with LIA respecting rights and interests of Labrador Inuit in Northern Qujebec.

LIA also has concerns about the composition of the Panel and has reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of Dr. Paul Wilkinson. That issue is now part of the public record.

LIA's apprehension of bias arises out of Dr. Wilkinson's ongoing representation of the Naskapis of Quebec in LIA's negotiations to settle its claims in Quebec; his representation of Naskapis of Quebec in their efforts to negotiate their claims in Labrador and his representations of Naskapi in the Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Co-ordination Committee under the JBNQA. LIA also understand that Dr. Wilkinson was involved in the negotiation of the Memorandum of Understanding, dated July 2nd, 1986, which, in many ways, governs this review.

LIA expressed its concerns in a letter to the Minister of Environment who rejected each and every point we made. In subsequent negotiations with FEARO, we suggested ways to address our concerns.

Andersen, Sub.

We proposed specific amendments to the Terms of Reference and suggested a way to deal with LIA's apprehension of bias.

We have since received a letter from the Minister of Environment amending the Terms of Reference for the Review. These reflect the second order recommendations suggested by LIA to FEARO to deal with our concerns. We appreciate this result but resent the process we had to undergo in order to achieve it. In addition, the core of our concerns remain. The Minister has bound his discretion in an agreement with the Kativik Regional Government that requires this development to be reviewed under a process that predetermines the importance of certain environmental components -- all of which relate to Northern Quebec and the aboriginal peoples of northern Quebec.

We are also still very apprehensive of bias on the part of Dr. Wilkinson. We are now more concerned than ever because we believe that his response to LIA's legal counsel in Wabush, September 29, 1986, is a distortion of the truth. He stated very clearly that the LIA negotiations with Quebec are terminated and were terminated before he became the Panel member. That simply is not the case.

Dr. Wilkinson was continually involved in the negotiation of LIA's Quebec claim and the negotiation of the Naskapis of Quebec claims in Labrador after his appointment to this Panel. In

Andersen, Sub.

July, he received on behalf of the Naskapis a copy of the French version of the proposed Labrador Inuit Quebec Agreement in Principle and undertook to provide one of LIA's legal counsel with the Naskapis' views about this document during the last week of August.

LIA's legal counsel was advised by Dr. Wilkinson on 25th of August, 1986, that he would be meeting with the Band Council of the Naskapis of Quebec on the 26th of August, 1986 and our legal counsel understood that the purpose of this meeting with the Naskapis of Quebec was to discuss a response by the Band Council to a letter which they had received from myself in connection with ongoing claims negotiations. Dr. Wilkinson also spoke to Chesley Andersen, our Land Claims Director, to set up negotiations sessions between LIA and the Naskapis of Quebec and then attended that meeting in Goose Bay on the 18th and 19th of September, 1986. At that meeting, he acted for and on behalf of the Naskapis of Quebec as a negotiator.

In addition, Dr. Wilkinson has continued to represent the Naskapis of Quebec on the Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Co-ordinating Committee under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. The fact that he has absented himself from committee meetings at the time that low level flying is discussed is recognized by LIA. That, however, is not the point. The point is that the Committee is concerned primarily with the management of wildlife

Andersen, Sub.

in northern Quebec and is required to give due consideration to the harvesting rights of the Naskapis of Quebec. In other words, Dr. Wilkinson as the Naskapi representative on the Co-ordinating Committee is charged with the responsibility to recognize and give due consideration to the harvesting rights of the Naskapis and, simultaneously, as a member of this Review Panel, is directed in the Terms of Reference to give due consideration to the guiding principle established in Section 23.2.2 of the JBNQA, that the rights and guarantees of the Naskapis set out in the harvesting section of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement be protected.

Andersen, Sub.

LIA has never considered its negotiations with Quebec as being "terminated" or "over" and we believe that those negotiations continued after the La Romaine hearings and that they are on-going.

LIA was surprised and disturbed to learn, without any prior notice and in a public forum, that its negotiations to settle its claims in Quebec had been terminated and were over with the question of future negotiations being entirely open.

As a result LIA contacted the Chief Negotiator for the Government of Quebec and expressed our astonishment and our concern that this was the first notice we had to the fact that our negotiations were over. We have been advised by the Chief Negotiator for Quebec that he is also disturbed by the statement made by Dr. Wilkinson on the 29th of September. He confirms that Quebec is continuing to work on an agreement in principle, which it hopes to sign before Christmas. The Government of Quebec takes the position that the negotiations have not been terminated but are temporarily suspended pending a return to the table of one of the negotiating parties.

LIA takes the position that negotiations are on-going and that there may be a suspension in talks once an agreement in principle is executed.

LIA's participation in the process: LIA cannot justify participation in a process in which it has no faith or respect. If FEARO cannot accommodate northern Quebec's concerns under JBNQA in one review without prejudice to Labrador, then FEARO must have two hearings. It has been done before and it can be

Andersen, Sub.

done again. However, we feel that FEARO cannot now hold two hearings, despite the fact that there is precedent for doing so, because the Minister has bound himself in his Memorandum of Understanding with the Kativik Regional Government dated July 2, 1986 to hold only one review.

The military flying activities represent a project based in Labrador. It is a project heard, seen and felt by Labrador Native people; a project whose prime impacts will be in Labrador; a process which distorts this to allow her priority consideration of Quebec interests is unacceptable to us, it should be unacceptable to our government as well.

LIA's position is clear. The public review process must be fair and honest in order to be meaningful. LIA is not prepared to legitimize this EARP by participating in it as it is currently established. We believe that it is not an honest one. Our participation is, at this stage, done under protest.

In addition to their written comments -- I have said all of those things, especially with regard to Dr. Wilkinson, not out of prejudice towards Dr. Wilkinson per se but it is the worry we have on the Labrador Inuit Association's perspective that this process may be, in the future, voided if seen as having had a lot of conflict of interest with regard to the proponent and any parties involved.

Andersen, Sub.

I would also question governments in recognizing the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. Is it that the government respects the northern Quebec Native parties, the James Bay Cree, northern Quebec Inuit and the Naskapi of Quebec, more than they respect any other Native people who are going to be impacted or is it that government is just looking at the letter of the law of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement? I always think that it is the latter.

I hope, with all due respect to Dr. Wilkinson -- we do have a lot of respect for the man, we have dealt with him for a couple of years -- that he will eventually see the light. After all, the way the process is going right now, it could well be that the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreements are going to determine what happens in Labrador eventually with regard to low level flying. In a sense, it is telling me that the Labrador Inuit are not going to have any real say nor the Naskapi and Montagnais of Labrador, for that matter.

Our position on low level flying: LIA is opposed, in principle, to any military activity on or over or above land, water, ice in our claimed area. Labrador Inuit history and experience with military presence and activities in Labrador give us every reason to continue this opposition. For example, the environmental disasters from the Pine Tree Line.

Andersen, Sub.

LIA has concerns about potential impacts on caribou and fur-bearers, water fowl and rafters in their breeding areas. We have asked for this EARP for six years so we could get proof of these impacts. DND's failure to fulfill its commitment in 1980 to monitor effects of low level flying on caribou, has meant we have lost valuable time and data. This data will not be forthcoming through this EARP. The reason for this is the time frame is too short. How can we study the impacts of low level flying on our wildlife, the fish, the land, the waters in one year?

This project prejudices our land claims process. These activities will establish the dominance of military activity on land and in the air and will threaten the process of Labrador Inuit self-determination which we were advancing through the land claims process.

The Labrador Inuit Association filed its land use and occupancy in 1977 and the statement of claim was accepted by the federal government. For nine years we have waited to get into active negotiations of our claims. Last year the then Minister of Indian Affairs, David Crombie, put LIA on the short list when the western Arctic settled their claims. After putting us on the short list for negotiations, or the so-called short list, the federal government decided that they needed a new comprehensive claims policy. Again, the LIA got put on the wait list

Andersen, Sub.

instead of the short list. We would have hoped to have been well on in negotiations by now, not only with regard to environmental protection but with all the issues that hopefully will be the future of the people of northern Labrador, one of which is not low level flying.

Because there is no policy now, the Newfoundland Government is refusing to negotiate with us. Then, in June, when we hoped that a new policy would come through, the federal government decides to change over all their ministerial positions, the Cabinet shuffle, as we call it, and we end up with a new Minister who does not know anything about the recommended policies by the Collican Task Force Report. So, now the commitment we have from the new Minister is that he will make a recommendation to Cabinet on the 5th of November, 1986 to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet.

With all of these expectations, the Labrador Inuit Association has put all its energy into the land claims process over the past two years. Therefore, this really important issue of low level flying that would impact not only Native people but all the people in Labrador, we are rushing around trying to get some honest answers and honest process. It seems as though we are not going to get it.

There is one other thing from this level that I would like to respond to and that is the

Andersen, Sub.

presentation made by the Naskapi-Montagnais-Inuit Association of Labrador in La Romaine, Quebec. According to the transcripts of those meetings, Ben Michel made some very strong statements about the Labrador Inuit Association and its membership. I do not know the relevance of his remarks, I do not understand why this process permits such representations to be made. Inasmuch as it appears to be acceptable to permit statements designed to attack the credibility of participants in order to influence the weight to be given to their submissions, I am forced to respond to Ben Michel on the record.

I do not know from what authority Ben Michel makes his statements about LIA and its membership, but it is obviously not accurate or reliable. The history of the Labrador Inuit Aboriginal Land Use and Occupancy, not only of the marine environment in northern Labrador but also of the interior of Labrador well into northern Quebec beyond the George River, is documented in "Our Footprints Are Everywhere". I will table a copy of this book for the Panel's information. It is the authority on the history and evolution of the Labrador Inuit into Canadian society.

Labrador Inuit Association represents approximately 4,000 members of whom 99 per cent are of Inuit ancestry living in several communities from Nain in the north to Happy Valley-Goose Bay in the south.

Andersen, Sub.

Labrador Inuit Association and Labrador Inuit Society are governed by Labrador Inuit customary law. We believe that our status as a people is enhanced by our use of customary laws as an element in the determination of our identity as a people. We believe that reliance on customary law provides a greater assurance of cultural cohesion and identity than the mere identification of blood lines.

Labrador Inuit are represented by the Labrador Inuit Association democratically. All members are free to elect a President and Vice-President of the Association on a regional basis. The members of LIA also elect on a community-by-community basis the directors of the Association. The members of the Association are represented at general meetings by delegates elected on a community by community basis for that purpose. Those people who are eligible to participate in this democratic process are identified according to the principle of Labrador Inuit custom and tradition, as outlined.

Finally, the Association maintains its contact with opinions and views of its membership, not only through the elected Directors of the Association but also by means of fieldworkers who are based in each community in Labrador in which significant numbers of Labrador Inuit live. As Labrador Inuit, we have survived many hardships, problems and injustices in non-recognition from any

Andersen, Sub.

sanctuaries. We have survived against great odds because of our respect for the land, the sea, the ice, the animals and each other. This close communion with our surroundings and environment is vital to our survival as Inuit because we cannot be separated from the use of the land, the sea and the animals.

As Labrador Inuit, we are proud to be part of Canada, yet we find it difficult to know where we stand in Canadian Confederation. As Labrador Inuit, we see ourselves as a distinct people within Canada and also as Canadians. The approach of NMIA is different. The Naskapi-Montagnais maintain they are a sovereign nation and do not recognize authorities of the Canadian Confederation. We do not understand how a single sovereign nation, the Montagnais-Naskapi of the Labrador-Ungava peninsula can be fragmented into Conseil Attikamek Montagnais of Northshore Quebec, the Naskapi-Montagnais Inuit Association of Labrador and the Naskapis of Quebec, nor do we understand how, as a sovereign nation, it does not recognize the Canadian Confederation. They continue to enjoy and demand its benefits.

Nevertheless, we respect them as a distinct Aboriginal people and do not suggest that their fragmentation into many political units and alliances or the apparent inconsistency of their position should result in any less weight or credibility being given to their views.

Andersen, Sub.

Ben Michel has accused LIA of ignoring the statements of Innu families who live in the training area. This is simply not true. On the question of impacts, LIA has chosen to participate in the Federal Provincial Steering Committee to design and implement a proposal to consider the impacts of low level flying on caribou. LIA has deliberately not entered into the public forum of debate on these issues because the issues are so polarized, so full of emotion and hidden agendas that rational debate at that level is hopeless.

We are not an appeal tribunal. That must somehow account for past judgments of the Inuu. More important, we do not need Innu statements about the impact of explosive near supersonic low level noise when we have our own experiences of it.

LIA has been on record as opposing low level flying and increased military activity. We have six years of correspondence with provincial and federal governments. We have made a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. We have chosen our forums and our processes carefully. We never said we would await the results of the FEARO process before committing ourselves. We said we wanted a chance to debate and analyze the issues and the facts, to present evidence of our own, and to challenge evidence of others. We intend to be an active participant in

Andersen, Sub.

the determination of the facts and the ultimate terms and conditions to be applied to these activities.

And finally, because we believe a fair settlement of our outstanding claims is the only way we are going to have a chance to protect our way of life and our environment, we have chosen to concentrate our efforts in that direction. Our problems are very similar to those of the Naskapi-Montagnais in Labrador but our approach to resolving them is very different. We are attempting to do so through the negotiated settlement of our claims and through the active advancement of Inuit rights in the Canadian constitutional process. We are not just deliverying rhetoric.

LIA appears before you now under protest and to put this protest on the record. While we have prepared some specific responses to the Draft Guidelines, we will make the submission without prejudice to any future decision to withdraw completely from the process or to challenge the continuation of this EARP. Our comments on the Draft Guidelines are intended to address the distortion that we believe comes from the overriding need to respect Quebec interests.

As was stated earlier by Mr. Brown, the Labrador Inuit Association takes very seriously the comments that are made by officials at the federal government. The then Justice Minister, John Crosbie,

Andersen, Sub.

was quoted in the "Evening Telegram" on the 12th of October, 1986 as saying that low level flying makes caribou macho, it makes them more potent. I think it is irresponsible for federal ministers or officials or any person to make jokes of not only the wildlife we have in the area but it is an insult to the people. We do not want a process that is an insult, we want a process that is going to determine what the final outcome of the project is going to be, whether it is recommended by you or whether it is accepted by the federal government.

We would also like to see a process that recognizes the people that are going to be affected. Perhaps one of the questions that Major McCabe could answer later is how much activity is proposed in Quebec with regard to low level flying as opposed to activity expected in Labrador with regard to low level flying.

The other recommendation I would like to make is under the Memorandum of Understanding between the Kativik Regional Government and the Department of Environment. There are some experts who are hired through that process and, from what I understand, all the experts have been hired from Quebec, experts on wildlife. What I would like to suggest is that we be given an opportunity to perhaps recommend some expert of our own. We have a resident biologist in Goose Bay, Labrador who works

Andersen, Sub.

for the Government of Newfoundland, who has been working on the George River caribou herd for about 17 years. Perhaps he could be considered as an expert on wildlife in Labrador.

At this point, in order to give our people the opportunity to perhaps participate, I will stop and thank you for listening to me. If there are any questions, I will try to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andersen.

I do not have a question but I would like to say something on your last point with regard to the technical experts being hired to support the work of the Panel. In the procedures under which this Panel operates, it has become accepted that anybody who is employed by either the federal or provincial governments is not considered as a suitable candidate to be engaged as a technical expert to support a Panel like this. We feel -- not that the Panel feels, but it is felt that hiring a government employee in that sort of capacity would not be appropriate. So, as knowledgeable as the gentleman to whom you refer may be with regard to caribou, for that reason he does not qualify to be engaged as a technical expert.

However, I am sure that all of the benefits of his knowledge will be made available to the Panel anyway by the government by which he is employed. I am sure that the Government of Newfoundland

and Labrador is just as interested as any other party is to see that this Panel receives all of the good information that it can get in order to come out with some sort of reasonable recommendations at the end of this process with regard to the project being reviewed.

We have attempted -- I should say, the Office has attempted to identify a resident of Labrador who could be engaged as a technical expert in the area of social and economic conditions in Labrador. Several persons have been considered and have been contacted but, unfortunately, neither of them is available to the Panel because of other work commitments. We are still trying to find a suitable resident of Labrador in that subject category. The Office has not been able to find one yet.

We would welcome any suggestions from the Labrador Inuit Association or from anyone else with regard to suitable candidates to be engaged as experts. The process of hiring experts is not finished, by any means.

Would you like Major McCabe to reply to your question at this time concerning the amount of flying activity being proposed for Quebec as compared with Labrador?

MR. ANDERSEN: I think I can wait for that to be answered.

With respect to us recommending Stuart to be an expert, why would he be so different than Dr.

Wilkinson being on the Panel? I would like to just add to the statement. Even though, like I said earlier, I have a great deal of respect personally for Dr. Wilkinson, I still have to say that northern Quebec Native parties under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreements are trying to file a position with the Government Newfoundland and the Government of Canada that Labrador Inuit will not sign any agreement on environmental issues without their consent, which to me is saying that Labrador Inuit cannot have any agreement on environmental issues without the approval of the northern Quebec Inuit, the James Bay Cree and the Naskapi of Schefferville. That was stated to me in September and one of the people who stated that to me was Dr. Wilkinson.

Now, are we going to hold Labrador Inuit at ransom like that; are we going to be held at ransom or are we going to bend all the rules and are you going to accept Stuart Luttich as one of the experts, whether or not he is a government employee or an employee of the Labrador Inuit Association?

THE CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, the situation regarding a Memorandum of Understanding and the James Bay/Northern Quebec Agreement is a situation that the Panel is not able to comment on. We were not involved in that documentation. We have been appointed since that was done and given a mandate to carry out. That really is, as I say, not a subject that the Panel could comment on.

Dr. Wilkinson is not an employee of the government, so it is not the same sort of situation as Mr. Luttich's position. Mr. Luttich is a government employee and, as I have said, such persons are not hired as experts.

Did you want to say anything else, Mr. Andersen?

MR. ANDERSEN: Not at this point. Depending on how the evening goes, we may wish to submit, still under protest, Part II of our submission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I could say on behalf of the Panel that we regret the way that the Labrador Inuit Association feels. We believe it is unfortunate that an organization, which obviously has much to contribute to the Panel by way of information to assist it in carrying out its mandate, would be doubtful about whether in fact it wants to participate. I hope that the LIA is able to reconsider its position and to become a full participant in the process.

MR. ANDERSEN: The Labrador Inuit Association will reconsider its position under one condition. We requested a letter from Dr. Wilkinson which would clearly state that he will sit on the Panel without prejudice or without bias for northern Quebec parties under the James Bay/Northern Quebec Agreement and the Northeastern Quebec Agreement. We have not received that letter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I explain what has

happened in response to that request? Dr. Wilkinson has decided, rather than to write to the Labrador Inuit Association or to any other participant, that he would write a letter to me as the Chairman of the Panel making the commitment that he would act in his capacity as a Member of this Panel without bias. I have received that letter and only a few days ago sent a copy of that letter the legal counsel of the LIA covered by a letter of transmittal of my own. I imagine that may still be in the mail and that might account for why you have not heard that yet. But it was sent a few days ago to the LIA's legal counsel in Mahone Bay, Nova Scotia.

Now, I am not sure whether Dr. Wilkinson has a copy of that letter with him this evening.

DR. WILKINSON: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, he does not have it with him. I do not believe that I have a copy either. The Secretary does have a copy of that letter, if you would care to see it, but I think it would serve for me to explain that that has happened, and I think the time factor of the mail is the reason why you have not heard of it from your own legal counsel.

MR. ANDERSEN: I will just ask Dr. Wilkinson one question. As you are aware, on September 18 and 19 when we met with you in the Naskapi Band Council of Schefferville, we agreed that we would arrange other negotiating sessions between each other with regard to the Naskapi's interest in Labrador --

the Naskapi's of Quebec interest in Labrador. If we set up another meeting, will you still be acting as their advisor?

DR. WILKINSON: I think we agreed at that time that, if necessary -- well, I think we agreed that the Naskapi party and the Labrador Inuit would continue to exchange information and keep one another up to date and, if appropriate to meet. Whether I would represent them in a future meeting, I would say, yes, my expectation is that I would. I have taken everything that you have said very seriously and I have consulted legal counsel and other informed people to seek advice on this question of apprehension of bias.

Now, so far, the reassurance they have given me is that they do not share the opinion of your legal counsel. Obviously, what I will do after tonight, particularly once we have a copy of your presentation, is I will take it back to them, I shall seek further advice from them and, if they were to advise me that in their opinion there would be an apprehension of bias or a conflict of interest or whatever it is, then I would have to make a choice either to remain on the Panel and to get off these other things, or to resign from the Panel and maintain my other activities.

Now, as the Chairman mentioned, as a result of your intervention in Wabush, I have sent a letter reaffirming my commitments which, I mean very sincerely, to act without bias. Now, I do not know whether that will satisfy you or not but I will await your response on that.

MR. ANDERSEN: I would perhaps be happy about that if you were not introduced as the past advisor to the Naskapi of Quebec or of Schefferville. In my opinion, and you can correct me if I am wrong, you are still an advisor to the Naskapi of Quebec?

DR. WILKINSON: Yes, I think I am introduced as such. I mean, I go to particular pains to make sure that I am and, when I prepared my resumé for the Chairman, that was the first point I put on it. I do not wish in any way to hide that or to play it down but my point is that I do not see any conflict between my areas of responsibility for the Naskapis and my areas of responsibility on the Panel. I really have thought deeply about this, first of all, before I signed the form for the federal government saying that I was free of bias and free of conflict of interest and, even more so, after your first allegatio -- allegation is perhaps too strong a word, but after your first remarks or whatever.

I really do not see, in practical terms, how, in any way, because of my association, any kind of pressure could be put upon me in such a way that I could try to influence the Panel to do something that would be, let us say, good for the Natives of Quebec and bad for LIA. I have spent a lot of time trying to imagine this and I just cannot see how it would

10R-19
_-A-1
ET:CO

happen. Now, that is my understanding of apprehension of bias. Since I have come to the conclusion that I could not do it, the things are so unrelated, it is that on which I base my personal judgment that there is no apprehension of bias.

I had not intended to reply this evening because I had wanted to think again about what you have said, but I will say that I also do not agree with your interpretation of the James Bay Agreement or of the Memorandum of Understanding. I do not think it gives as much to the Natives of northern Quebec as you think. Again, that is a point that I am prepared to provide a written reply on, which you legal counsel can analyze and advise you on.

MR. ANDERSEN: So, in other words, under your terms of reference in the Memorandum of Understanding with the Kativik Regional Government, when this process is over the northern Quebec parties are going to have a chance to go over this whole process again before the report comes out and other Native people are not. The Labrador Inuit are not going to have that opportunity, the Naskapi-Montagnais-Inuit Association are not going to have that opportunity, the Montagnais of Northshore Quebec are not going to have that opportunity, but the James Bay Cree and northern Quebec Inuit and the Naskapi of Schefferville will get a second kick at it. We do not.

DR. WILKINSON: They do not get the opportunity or they will not get the opportunity under the James Bay Agreement to go through the process again. There is a minor consultation, an appeal procedure, which is not excluded under EARP, it is not specifically included, either, but there is nothing in EARP that would preclude LIA, for example, from making the same kind of representations to the Ministers that the native people of northern Quebec would make.

MR. ANDERSEN: I have no further comments at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, then, thank you very much, Mr. Andersen.

MR. ANDERSEN: Thank you.

By the way, this is a copy of «Our Footprints» that is for your records.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. As a matter of fact, we were certainly aware of the existence of that book. The best we were able to do so far was to borrow a copy from somebody else, so we really appreciate getting this copy of our own. Thank you very much.

There are two people who have added their names to our list of speakers for tonight and we will now hear from the first of them. Mr. Jerry Sillitt of Nain.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JERRY SILLITT:

MR. JERRY SILLITT: In Labrador, I am the Chief Elder of Nain. I am not just thinking of my Nain people at this point in time. I would like to pass along some of the thoughts that I have

Sillitt, Sub.

on behalf of all Labrador people and there are two things that I would like to speak on.

I would say, first of all, I am thinking along the same lines as the Indians of North West River and the other Indians. The only work there is will show up in Goose Bay. You will not do us any good, not for the Inuit or the Indians.

Many people would like to work in Labrador and Newfoundland. The Indians from North West River, even though they are close to Goose Bay, know that they will not be hired in any of these work projects.

It is the same thing; the Inuit people would probably be treated the same way because of the lack of education. That is why I say this. It will not be very much use to us, no matter how much work comes up in Goose Bay as mentioned here today, especially for the people of Northern Labrador, for the Indians and the Inuit.

The other part is on the planes that fly low. I would like to say what I think.

These planes fly low around here and if there are going to be more, it is going to be hard on us in the future for the Inuit and the Indians.

As I see it now and think, the caribou that we use for food, will they always be here? It makes me wonder. Not only the caribou, other wildlife of all kinds that stay on the surface of the ground will disappear somewhere. I will try and make sense of what I am saying and what I know.

In the past, there used to be lots of wildlife on the southern part of Labrador. There used to be lots of caribou and on their barren lands and on lands that they used to hunt, they would get enough caribou from their own area. So what happened? There is no caribou there to the south of us now.

Take Hopedale, Postville, Makkovik and even Rigolet. All those have to come up here to our area now to caribou hunt because there is no more caribou in their area. Or do they have to wait for many, many years because the caribou are so scarce down there and have to use a lot of money? They have to come up here caribou hunting. What is going to happen in the future? We do not know.

Them and us, all of us, are trying to use our land because this is all we have left and the only area to hunt now. If you had these planes flying low and you get more of them and if the caribou should move or other wildlife, where will we go to hunt? Has anyone thought of this?

I would just like to say on this score that a person could say that the caribou are not going to be harmed by planes that fly low. That I do not believe.

That is all I have to say. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much

Mr. Sillitt.

I believe before we go on to our next speaker it would be a good idea to have a short break in the meeting. Let us break for about ten or 12 minutes, please.

---Short recess

---Upon resuming at 9:10 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before we go on, I would like to say that, although this schedule for this meeting says that the session will end at ten o'clock, that certain does not mean that at ten o'clock we are going to get up and pack our bags and leave. We are staying in Nain tonight and we are quite prepared to go on a little beyond ten o'clock if there are people who wish to speak to us. So I would again encourage you to come forward and speak, if you feel that you have anything at all to say that might be useful to the Panel.

We are next scheduled to hear from Joanna Andersen, also a resident of Nain.

---SUBMISSION BY MS JOANNA ANDERSEN:

MS JOANNA ANDERSEN: I am a Native person. I have not been educated and I will not be holding anything that I would read from. We are people just here from the land, irregardless of what colour, whether it is Inuit, Indian, German, we all have minds of our own. We, using our own thoughts and what we can think of, what we used to do in the past when we used to be children and the way we grew

Andersen, Sub.

up, our grandfathers, our fathers, all of them, we all remember them and their lifestyle. We think of those. Maybe all of us feel part of this at times. Not one person will ever forget who brought him up because a person cannot forget and will always remember.

Even though I am not educated, I would first of all like to tell you about the lifestyle we had when I grew up.

When we were small in the summer or in the winter, our fathers used to get food for us from the land, animals, maybe not from too far away, either. These were animals for our food, and without going through any hardship it seemed. As we were growing up, we could follow our parents, whether it be girls or boys, even though we were quite young and we used to go this way. Maybe he got a caribou or maybe they went fishing for char and/or codfish and we as kids would follow them so we could carry the food home, either from the hunting grounds or from the char fishing grounds or from the cod fishing grounds and we as children would get tired, even though we used to have to walk a long ways and it would be very warm at times and we would sweat a lot.

I would always remember that right until I grew up. Like our fathers used to take us to those hunting areas, we would see how far away it was. It was not very far. You may have houses there, maybe just across the river and sometimes, you

Andersen, Sub.

would go a bit further and I used to recall carrying them quite far. It was easy in the past.

It used to be quite hard. It was not so hard after all with dog teams with which we would hunt. Without the dogs now, we use ski-doos. They go very fast now. It used to take us much longer to get to those hunting areas, especially in April. Maybe it would take you all day or maybe even two days and now you can travel that course in a couple of hours because we have the machines but, even after that, we cannot travel again. They might break down and then you cannot go anywhere but, if you get a dog team, even if the weather was bad, the dog team would take you home, no matter what the weather was like and all the Inuit people used these. That is why we were quite happy when we had dogs. We miss them now.

These machines are not strong compared to the dogs that we had. We always think about these things and now, and not too far in the past and in our land here, here at Nain and all around the hills around Nain, there used to be caribou, right around the community here, and now they have to go far to hunt, the man have to go far afield.

The things that were mentioned just now, the noise of the aircraft, are to blame for some of this. Me, myself, as an old lady, saw this. I have my own sons and children and I look after my children because I am still alive today and a mother.

Andersen, Sub.

I am not just going to stay home. In the spring I like to see what my grandchildren might be doing, so that is why I like to go along because they do not have a father. I act as the male parent to them. I am not going to be left behind; I still go along on the hunting trips. Even though I am getting old now, I just do not stay home.

I will say this: About three times now in Nain Bay, I have seen these aircraft. You take us now. I am with them up there hunting because I always go along and I would say I was not going to go but now I decided to go along, thinking of the food and so that the food would not be wasted that they might catch, because I am the mother and have to look after this.

The son may have decided that he would want to do something and you have flies, too, that can spoil fish. So I go along to clean the fish and make sure that it is saved.

We were going up there and we were near the island going up to Nain Bay and you see Rhodes Island to the east. So I always keep an eye out and look around for things when I go off on trips where I might see any wildlife. My eyesight is still good and I can see wildlife quite easily. I see smoke coming down there to the east and, because my mind does not think as fast as it used to, I thought maybe there was someone picking berries on there. So I watched this and then I saw this smoke. I thought

Andersen, Sub.

there may be a fire down there. I did not see the shape of the aircraft because it was in the breast of the land and here comes a plane along by the island and it went west along there, along by the high hill. It was much lower than the height of the hill there, going very fast. Whether it be a woman or a man, they can see these because it was a beautiful nice day and we may get some caribou and I will be working at this. I will also work at the char fish that they would get.

We went to shore. It was a beautiful, warm day. They were down to the beach, swimming, and a plane was flying along there and they ran up into the trees. Those planes are taking away some of the animals that we might use for food because they come through there quite fast. It even sounds like rocks falling down from the cliffs. No wonder that the animals are scared and run into the trees.

We are not going to say something that we just heard about. I have seen them more than once myself, at least three times, those low flying aircraft. That is why I say that it is hard to try and get these animals for food and you have these planes going through there. So it is not too hard to try and help the people.

I have been somewhat south, North West River. I have seen everything that everyone else has and they feel that their caribou have been lost. They may have some other food or domestic animals that they use to buy their food. These caribou are all we have for fresh meat and we would like to keep that and we would not want them scared away by those low flying aircraft.

Thank you. That is all I have to say at this point in time because there may be someone else wishing to speak. I am not shy to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Andersen. I hope that other people here in Nain will follow your example and speak to us tonight.

Our next scheduled speaker is Miss Barbara Kitowski.

---SUBMISSION BY MS BARBARA KITOWSKI:

MS BARBARA KITOWSKI: Good evening. My name is Barbara Kitowski and I am one of the nurses who work in Nain. I have been in Labrador for about two years now and most of that time was spent in Nain, and before that, I worked in various areas along the coast in various villages on the north coast.

Because I love the outdoors and because I love Labrador and I also care very much for the people, I take this opportunity to express from my heart some of my feelings and some of the things which I know from having talked to the people.

I do not have a whole lot to say and I would like to make it simple because I think, then, that there is a better understanding by everyone.

I know that there is a limited area for the flying, but I also know from having seen with

Kitowski, Sub.

my own eyes that the low level flying is carried on in areas other than those which are supposed to be recognized areas.

This summer, it was in August, I was ten miles up the Fraser River Canyon on a canoe trip and was eating lunch on a sand bar with my friend and there was no sound, except, all of a sudden, a tremendous sound, like an explosion, came over the cliffs and all of a sudden, we saw three F-4s overhead.

It could have been the same planes but, also, in June, I was on the Churchill River and almost every day out of seven days we saw these F-4s in low level flying tactics there, and they would come over several times. The first time was very frightening because you do not hear them until you actually see them overhead. You hear a loud boom and you look up and there they are. It is a terrible noise, to put it mildly. Many of you may have heard it for yourself but it is frightening to humans who understand it but, to the animals who certainly do not understand it, I can only imagine what it does to their daily living practice and their reproduction cycles.

I know that there is not enough time for studies to be done but I think that common sense shows that any time that there is an increase in the number of people in an area and also the numbers of machinery, like ski-doo, trucks, et cetera, and worst of all now, the jets with the loud noise, there will

Kitowski, Sub.

certainly be a change in the animal patterns and the animal numbers.

Right now, I think that the caribou herds are protected to a certain extent by their remoteness and the fact that people cannot get to them a great deal. This has been changed by the ski-doo but I would like to also add that perhaps many people in Labrador, because they are so excited about the prospect of getting a job, are not realizing all the adverse effects of the military coming in.

I come from the United States and I have seen plenty of expansion of airports and plenty of expansion of military areas, practice areas. I would like to say that any time that the military comes in, in my experience I have seen increased control of jobs, increased control of many things that are occurring in the area and I believe that, if the people of Labrador, especially the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, think that they will have more jobs, I think that they are fooling themselves because the military will require technical skills and I do not think, from what I have seen, that most people in Labrador are prepared with technical skills or education, just as Jerry Sillitt said tonight. So that the jobs which are taken up will be by very few Labrador people and, after that, it will be military.

Why should the military not just hire military, because that is what they will have? They will go into Canada and they will have their own military

Kitowski, Sub.

people. This is my own guess but this is what I have seen happen in the States and I can imagine that the same thing could happen here.

But I would just like to say to everyone here that I do not personally see that many jobs being available to the general public because of the technical quality of the jobs which will be required.

The multi-national activities going on right now between Germany and Canada and Holland and Norway in Canada are going ahead, regardless of anything that is being studied right now, and so there is increasing growth and increasing activity anyway in Goose Bay and so it is there, whether we like it or not.

Whenever you have increasing forces coming in from the outside, such as when the Americans were here years ago in Goose Bay, I know from the people who lived in that area who told me themselves, that on their holiday or on their days off that the military go out in their choppers and they have a lot of access to fishing areas and caribou hunting which other people do not have. So they can go out and help themselves a great deal.

Also, sometimes it is not exactly for hunting. There is a little fun target practice going on or had been in the past. I do not know what is happening now but this is what I was told happened in the past. So that the military probabl

Kitowski, Sub.

would have some access to getting out into the country that the people do not have. I do not think that is right, either.

The rescue helicopter, the large air safety rescue helicopter, I also have seen on the Churchill River taking a crew of fellows out on the weekend for a fishing trip. It carries quite a few military in it. Maybe this is all fine and good but just think that the more military there are, the more access there will be to remote areas because they have the aircraft to do it with.

So I guess the main thing that I am trying to sum up is that, for the group who are yelling so loudly about the possibility of jobs in Goose Bay, really need to look at what they are getting into because they will have a job and they will earn some money but the things that they like to pursue outdoors, because of increased military, will no longer be there. So they will have their increased income and their better life but what will they do with it then? They cannot really continue the lifestyle that they have now.

As for Nain and Makkovik and the other villages along the coast, the people who live here love it and I have seen people come out of Nain, go to live in a different area for various reasons, maybe for a couple of months or a couple of years, but, for some reason, they are always drawn back to Nain because it is their home and I think that the Inuit are like

Kitowski, Sub.

this, by history, if you read about them in other parts of the world. So I do not think that they would be thinking of or wanting employment in the Goose Bay area where the increased military would be, whether it is multi-national agreement employment through that or whether it is going to be NATO.

So that, considering the closeness that the people feel to their land and their village, I do not see any benefit as far as jobs go.

Also, I would like to make just one comment on the possibility of a proposed sea base that was mentioned, I think, in the Draft Guidelines. I have read it someplace along in all of this, just to realize what could happen with the proposed sea base, with weapons out in the ocean, the increased traffic of large ships coming into the area.

How can it help but not adversely effect damage to the patterns of the fish that come into the area now, which are certainly decreasing, anyway, for various reasons. But what is left, I think, would be completely destroyed by a sea base.

We all know, as was mentioned earlier, there is not time for a study to be done to prove this but, looking at other parts of the world, it has been proven that this is what happens.

I do not know how many people in Nain are aware of it but to the few that are here, I would like to say to you: Just think about these things, such as a weapons sea base. Do you really think it would be good for the fish or for the whales or for the seals that you depend on?

That is all I have to say and thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Next, Mr. Danny Jararuse of Hopedale would like to speak to the Panel.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. DANNY JARARUSE:

MR. DANNY JARARUSE: I am Dan Jararuse from Hopedale. I only have a few comments to say for the low level flying.

Since the low level flying has started in Goose Bay for a few years, it has been disturbing the wildlife and the whale life. When it destroys along the coast, in the future, they will be doing the same thing that they did before.

I know it is hard to agree with people that we do not know and it is too hard for people who do not understand what is going on. All I know is I am trying to help my people from Hopedale to let them know that I am searching for the right thing.

It will be disturbing the water from along the coast and our drinking water. It is my concern that I have in searching for what I have to know about the low level flying and I know there are quite a few people from Hopedale who must have seen the low level flying a couple of times this past summer.

I know it is hard for the hunters or

Jararuse, Sub.

the fishermen in the areas where they hunt and fish.

There is one more thing before I close. I am thankful for the use of the LIA setting me up for the meeting here and hopefully, in the future, I will be talking to you again.

I thank you again for this evening. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Now, I do not have any more names on my list of speakers. Major McCabe has asked me if he might have a few minutes to clarify some points that were raised earlier by some other speakers but, before I ask Major McCabe to speak, I would like to give an opportunity to the people of Nain and Hopedale to speak first because that is why we are here.

So would anyone else like to come forward at the present time and speak? Yes, sir? Please come ahead.

---SUBMISSION BY PARTICIPANT FROM NAIN:

PARTICIPANT FROM NAIN: I was back there thinking for quite some time just what I was going to say that would make sense. I have not quite made up my mind on what I am going to speak.

I was listening to people what people were saying and there were a lot of things that were not quite understood by the Inuit people. Some of it I understood quite clearly when there was somebody saying we have never forgotten the ways of our fathers

Nain Participant, Sub.

or grandfathers. Because we are Inuit, we are still not used to the white man's food; we are used to our own food. I can remember when I was a child that we never even had a freezer to keep our meat in. So we did not eat anything from the stores. We ate Inuit people's food, from the land and from the sea.

Today, we still do that. We learned from our parents and today, we are teaching our children to be Inuit.

Maybe a lot of people think we have lots of money. We do not have money; we do not have anywhere to make any money. The people who see our land, they do not recognize land; we do. In the summer, we as fisherman fish for two months to try and make a few dollars and the year has 12 months. In two months, we make some money and that money that we make in those two months, we have to try and keep alive on that for the next ten months to buy things from the store. Many things we cannot buy from the store. We have to eat the food that we can get from the land and that is not all.

We do not have domestic meat that we might eat every day. We would prefer the wild meat. Even though I say that, we may want to buy something from the store but we do not have any money to buy it.

How could we be recognized? We are the Inuit people in our own land, right up until today. It seems we are not recognized today.

Nain Participant, Sub.

As I am saying that, I would like to go on to the low level flying. This is not just what I heard; we are seeing it today and for the past six years right through the areas that we hunt. We go through there and those planes are so loud, you cannot even hear your own ski-doo engine or even your own outboard engine when one of these aircraft come overhead.

I wish you would believe us. We are not just trying to argue with you. We want our lifestyle. We are not going against the white man's way; we just want to live our own lifestyle. We do not go down into southern society and do the same thing or to any other areas and yet, today, we have people from the white society coming up and interfering with our lands.

It is not because we dislike the white person. We want to be recognized for who we are also.

I may have quite a bit to say because I would like you to understand this. We try to get our points across and to be recognized and what we do not want is whatever we have said here and listened to at this meeting here and then, when the meeting is over all we had to say is just closed in the building here and forgotten about again. This is the sort of thing that we do not like.

Many of the things that I would have wanted to say and what was said was quite correct, so I am not going to go on any further.

Thank you very much for listening to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. We have been pleased to hear you.

I believe there is another person over on the side who has indicated that he would like to speak. Please come over, sir.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. ABEL LEO:

MR. ABEL LEO: Thank you.

My name is Abel Leo from Nain. I have a few things that I would like to say of what I think and to try and help my fellow people in Labrador, not only in Nain but from Goose Bay, Rigolet, Makkovik, Postville, Hopedale and Davis Inlet right to Nain.

I am recognized by all the people from those communities. I am just a fisherman and hunter. That is the way I am recognized. I have tried it all. That is why I would like to have something to say at this time of what I think.

I have had hard times and been very poor. Sometimes I would have things. Today, I have probably just about all I need of everything. When I was growing up, there was nothing; we had nothing.

I was happy because I was never hungry. Sometimes we may have been a little bit hungry but we did have the food that was mentioned earlier.

I am not going to talk too long on

Leo, Sub.

this and I would just like to back up what other people had said because what they said was true.

When I was growing up, there was a lot of codfish everywhere, more than enough for Labrador, even enough for the islanders of Newfoundland.

Today, nobody can get enough. We try hard, whichever way we can and we cannot find the fish anymore.

Also, I would like to talk a bit on the planes, the low level flying planes, people who hunt, and also the helicopters because they fly everywhere.

I have hunted just about everywhere with hunters, on the water and on the barren lands, wherever there were trails that we could use. Up on the barrens, I have seen planes up there hunting and what-not but you have caribou all over the place up there.

Take August 1982. I was in Voisey's Bay char fishing. There was lots of caribou around there in the Bay, on both sides of the Bay and across each side of the river and they would come out of the trees there anywhere around our camp, did not mind us fishing there. Twice I saw aircraft in the space of almost two weeks that I was there. As soon as there were two aircraft that came through there and flew over the caribou, the caribou disappeared, there were none there after that.

Also, these caribou that travel in

Leo, Sub.

on the barren lands. They come down close to our area in the spring. I have never been satisfied. The caribou go north over to George River and as far as Chimo and then come back again in the spring and hang around on the barren lands. Yet, these caribou spend most of their time in Labrador and I am not satisfied because they are called the George River caribou herd.

The low level flying that you are talking about, the Indians in North West River had a meeting sometime in early summer, I am not quite sure when, maybe about two months ago, even. John Crosbie had a meeting with them. I mention John Crosbie's name so that he will recognize who I am.

He was at that meeting and said this over the radio, and I heard him over the radio. The people of Labrador, the Inuit and the Indians are not satisfied with low level flying, so what happens now when they hunt caribou with ski-doos? Do they not scare the caribou with those ski-doos? I was not satisfied with the way he said that and as he was talking about this, what happens now? Do the Inuit and the Indians not chase caribou with ski-doos? No, he does not know how to hunt. He was just talking. If he had been a hunter, he probably would have said something completely different.

Take this low level flying aircraft coming over very low. They scare the caribou when they are flying low. They are very noisy and especially after they have been chased by helicopters and/or other aircraft, and you get these loud aircraft that fly low, John Crosbie seemed not even to be thinking of what these low level flying aircraft would have on these caribou. These caribou scatter all over the place.

When you are hunting on a ski-doo, you do not do this because the person that is using the ski-doo knows he does not do that. He uses his ski-doo to transport him to the hunting grounds. They do not go in there chasing the caribou with the ski-doos. They are not just going to chase away what they are hunting. They may get as close as they can with the machine and try and stay out of sight of the herd.

These are the things that I wanted to mention mostly and I am thankful that I had this opportunity to be able to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are welcome, sir. Thank you very much.

I understand now that Mr. William Andersen would like to speak again; this time, on his own behalf.

Mr. Andersen?

12-A

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN:

MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just for the record, this is not the position of the LIA or a speech on behalf of the LIA.

Andersen, Sub.

It is completely on my own behalf.

When the military or the Government of Canada speaks of economic boosts for the region with regard to military, I think there is one question that should be made clear to the people. If you spend time in the communities from Rigolet to Nain and, like the fishermen, the housewives, the mothers, whoever were saying here today, if you look at the conditions under which they have to live in a supposedly First World country, you would think twice about putting in a military activity place in Goose Bay.

Just a few months ago the Government of Canada announced a $93 million economic boost for the military in Goose Bay over the next ten years. Who is going to benefit from that? Is it the people in Goose Bay who are going to benefit? I know that there is going to be housing. Who are going to get the houses? The local people? If my guess is correct, it is Germans and Dutchmen who are going to get the houses and yet, we cannot even get a few dollars to try and put up to what is called the Canadian standard on the coast housing for our own people.

Services that are considered automatic in southern Canada we have been trying to get for years and years up here, water and sewer and housing, proper education facilities. The Government of Canada do not have the money for that.

Andersen, Sub.

Just this summer for the six communities, the Government of Canada was really generous and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. For Rigolet, Makkovik, Postville, Hopedale and Nain, they are spending $600,000 for housing, for water and sewer, for municipal services, for garbage collection, you name it, and yet, in one summer, just to destroy a small little place like Saglek where there are a few buildings, the Government of Canada awards a contract for $5 million? Just to destroy the place.

I think these are the kinds of things that the Panel should consider as well if you are looking at economic boosts for the area.

Military personnel from foreign countries are going to come in. They will be able to buy ski-doos and not pay taxes. They do not have to pay taxes. They work 12 months a year and do not pay taxes. Yet, the fishermen, like Aba Kojak was saying, fish for two months and probably has to spend all his earnings to buy a ski-doo for the winter to try and keep his family and yet, they are the highest taxed people in the country. Where is the justice?

I might personally agree with military people coming in if they are subject to the same taxes as we are. Who are the privileged? Everyone is saying that we the privileged because we are going to get a base. When the base goes back to Goose

Bay, it will probably be the last time that my friends and I here will ever see the base again because the security system is so damn tight that we will not be allowed up there.

The same kind of food and the same kind of machinery will probably be three or four dollars a pound cheaper for meat and a couple of thousand dollars cheaper for machinery for the military. I do not see justice in that. I do not see any economic gains for the people in that. Yet, at the same time, the only economic activity that could be practiced is possibly going to be destroyed by these low flying jets, the fish, the furbearers. That is the kind of thing that I believe should be considered in the Guidelines, if you are going to consider economics. We will never benefit.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andersen.

I would like to give one more opportunity to anybody from Nain or Hopedale to speak before I give some time to Major McCabe. Would anyone else here like to speak?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JOHN IGLOLIORTE:

MR. JOHN IGLOLIORTE: I have not talked to the white man all that much. I do understand and I want to be understood that I am here just to try and help my fellow Labradorians in Labrador.

As you are talking about low level

Igloliorte, Sub.

flying; for a long time now I have known of them because I worked in Goose Bay when the Americans were there. Ever since then, I have known of these, especially concerning the wildlife, from that time. I found out that, when those planes are being used in Labrador, that the wildlife was starting to disappear from around the Goose Bay area and even as far north as Nutak, I have travelled by dog team, by ski-doo and I have always seen aircraft in all these areas, helicopters, inland, in on the barrens, out on the water. I have seen these low level flying aircraft or these fast flying planes ever since the military have been around Goose Bay.

I have never liked these aircraft because I felt that they were driving the wildlife away, all kinds of wildlife are disappearing. Also, there was something mentioned earlier on about the sea which made me think quite a bit. If there is going to be a training range on the sea, I do not go along with this because our wildlife in Labrador are disappearing.

Say, for one year they had these large ships that come from everywhere. The draggers that came in here for one year made the fish disappear, too. They ruined the spawning grounds and for ten years there were no fish in Labrador.

Also, the low level flying aircraft drive away the wildlife. How then will the wildlife come back after they have been driven away and what

Igloliorte, Sub.

happens when there is nothing left? When these aircraft leave, what are we going to have left to hunt for food?

I would like this quite clearly understood on these low level flying aircraft. They are making the animals disappear, as I said earlier. Somebody said earlier, like Makkovik, Hopedale, Postville area, no caribou anymore. I think it was Jerry that mentioned it and this is quite true. Are then, if our caribou disappear because of the low level flying, we going to get help from you? How are we going to make any money if we have nothing to make money from?

All the people who talked before me made a lot of sense and it is quite true what they said. They do only fish for two months of the year, hardly get enough weeks in for UIC and sometimes even some of them have to try and find other work to be able to qualify for UIC.

Years ago, you did not have any social services. There was no freezer in the past. What we used to do was dry our fish or our other food that we used in the wintertime because there were no freezers because any wildlife or meat, especially caribou meat, spoils quickly. So we would like you to think of what the Indians and Inuit people had to go through and even today. It seems that nobody believes them, even today.

Also, someone had mentioned that, as

Igloliorte, Sub.

soon as we finish meeting in the building here, and as soon as you leave here, maybe you are here just for a few hours, as soon as you leave here, all that was said here will be forgotten about again. This has happened in the past.

This is why I would like you to understand that we do not want to be just left behind or whatever we say we do not want to be just left behind closed doors. We have just met here for a few hours.

I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to say what I would like to have said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

I believe there was a lady at the back of the room who indicated she would like to speak. Would you come up, please? May we have your name for the record, please?

---SUBMISSION BY MS ROSINA HOLWELL:

MS ROSINA HOLWELL: My name is Rosina Holwell from Nain.

As a mother, I used to hear things said about the low level flying. Last fall, my family and I went out to Graveyard Tickle where I would go berry-picking with my children and my husband brother and my son would go goose hunting.

Just as we arrived at Graveyard Tickle there was a loud bang that we heard. As soon as my children heard this loud noise, the three girls

Holwell, Sub.

began to cry because they thought for sure that planes were coming in to bomb them. I did not know what to think of it myself and I believed it was -- I have forgotten what you called it earlier, I have forgotten the word -- but, anyway, it was a really loud noise, like something backfired. My oldest girl wanted to go back to Nain because she thought for sure there was a war going on around that area but my husband explained to them that there was nothing going on but that that was a jet passing by.

Another time, too, just this past summer, early or late spring, there had been a couple of planes or jets flying by here at Nain. My girls were playing outside with their friends and, as soon as they heard these loud noises, they ran into the house and they thought for sure again that there was war coming into Nain.

I think these jets were reported by local people to somewhere outside. As a housewife and a mother, how am I to respond to my children when they ask me if there is war coming to Nain, just by these loud jets coming and flying around?

It is the same where they say: What you see is what you do not get. I do not believe in that anymore after hearing those low level flying jets. We did not have to see them; we just had to hear them and it scared the hell out of us, scared the hell out of the people of Nain, I believe.

My son, this summer, had his first

caribou. He is ten years old, but my husband and brother had to take him all the way up north to get his first caribou. It is a proud thing for Inuit young men to get their first animal, their first seal, their first caribou, their first partridge. It is the pride and joy of their family and probably within their own community. How many of our young people or our young men here in Nain now are going to have an opportunity to get their first caribou when they have to go so far off?

Maybe some of the young people's parents here cannot afford to go or do not even have a ski-doo. How are they going to be known within their community as young men? They probably will not be recognized as young men now because they never had their first caribou or their first seal.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Yes, there is a person at the back that would like to come forward and speak.

---SUBMISSION BY JULIUS MERKURATSUK:

MR. JULIUS MERKURATSUK: My name is Julius Merkuratsuk. I work for the LIA.

I was listening to what everybody was saying and I was not sure that I would have anything to say. I would just like to say two things.

First of all, I listened to the Major talking and when he was talking about the dummy shells and/or bombs that they are using even now, we would like to be heard, too.

Labrador is a place where there is no people, just a place that you might use for training and/or playing around. We are proud of our land that we hunt, too. They think maybe that it is just a place that they can use for this low level training and what-not.

I would also like to say we are trying to help our people of Labrador. When you think of Hopedale and Postville, it almost seems that they are getting left out.

If you are looking to hear from everybody from Labrador, you should listen to them, too, not just some of them. Trying to get everyone into one community is quite hard, especially when you have people who are trying to work. You might hear a lot more if you could get into all these communities.

Also, even though that may be the case and you may have a heavy job, there should not be any thoughts on that. There are people here in Labrador and the people who are using these areas for low level training should not think that Labrador is an area that is barren and with no people. There are people living in these areas.

I do not want this to be forgotten, that Labrador does have people. It is not a barren country that is without people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Yes, there is a lady over on the side. Would you like to come over, please?

---SUBMISSION BY MS TABIA MURPHY:

MS TABIA MURPHY: I am Tabia Murphy from Nain. I am a Nain Inuit.

For us Inuit people, the wildlife is very important for our food, our main food. I am mostly speaking for the whole people of every place, possibly, the Indian and the Inuit and the Settlers who have lived here all their lives.

It is true that low flying planes, especially the jets, are very frightening to these animals. We do not just depend on caribou, as a lot of people think. There are other animals that we depend on, like geese, partridges, ducks and other small things like that.

This is very, very important for us to have fresh meat. There is nothing like fresh meat. What we get from the store here does not seem to give us enough energy. Maybe you call it enough iron. There is a lot of iron in these animals. It is very, very important for us, especially the old people.

I have heard an old woman saying that, if I do not have something fresh my stomach aches. The things we buy from the store mean nothing to my stomach.

I understand about that. I myself feel we cannot continue this situation. I get very, very hungry, even if I eat something that we buy from

Murphy, Sub.

the store.

Another thing that I wanted to point out is that I think these small planes that come up here in the summer that bring the hunters, I think they should also be careful not to spill a lot of gasoline or other things like that, harmful things like that for the animals, because we like to eat animals that are healthy.

Also, another thing that I am worried about or what we are worried about a lot are these plans that go off hunting, the carelessness of their using fuel or gasoline or oil that could cause forest fires and that would kill a lot of animals. That would mean that our people here would have a hard time when going off hunting would have to go further, even further. Everything costs so much now. Most of our people here have hardly any money. The hunting equipment is very, very expensive now, the ammunition, the guns and especially the ski-doo in the wintertime. We have to go miles and miles to go hunting.

I also think it is important to avoid flying over the hunting grounds of the Inuit and the Indian people. These are my concerns.

I come to this meeting because I heard that there is a meeting about the low flying of the aircraft.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would anyone else from the community like to speak?

Well, perhaps this might be a good time, then, to invite Major McCabe to take a few minutes to say some things about some points raised by some speakers earlier today.

Major?

MAJOR McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I only have just a couple of comments on things I have heard today. Part of my job is to tell people about the proposals that we are studying and the other is to try and answer any concerns or to give information about things. Many of the concerns we have heard today have been heard in many other places and those are the kinds of things that we need to know that will be studied. Some of these things are being studied already. There is a study on the effects of the aircraft on caribou that has been going on this year and will continue next year.

Those studies are being done by specialists and we await the results of those because they will help us in all of the kinds of things we want to do.

I am not sure if there is anyone still here from the Town Council that was here this afternoon. I just have a couple of comments on some of the things they had mentioned.

With respect to the weapons ranges, a comment was made about a concern about chemicals and defoliants, as the term is used.

We do not have any intention at all of using any kind of chemical weapons. We do not use them anywhere in Canada and we are certainly not going to use them in Labrador. Defoliants, as I understand the term and I know there has been concern in many countries about defoliants, we do not use them. We know that they are dangerous.

There are certain herbicides that are used to control plant growth, for example, along power lines, transmission lines. Those are used in various parts of Canada but I do not really see that they would be used in a weapons range. I can assure you that there will be no chemical weapons used.

There was a concern expressed, I think, on a couple of occasions that, having a training base in Goose Bay or having weapons stored there would make it a priority target in time of war.

This is not so. You must understand we are talking about a training base, like a large school. It is not an operational base. Targets in war are selected more with respect to the military where they have an operational base, where they keep equipment and people, even industrial centres, major harbours, things like that. Goose Bay, by having a training centre, is not going to become a target. In fact, in time of tension, all the aircraft that would be there would return back to their homes in Europe because that is where they would be needed. There would not be those fighters there.

There was a statement made with reference to the sea range that I talked about, that it would be undoubtedly held north of Nain. I do not know what that is based on because we certainly have not looked up there.

You must understand, these aircraft have very limited fuel supplies. They would try, if they are going to have a range at all, they would try and have it much closer to Goose Bay, sort of straight out east somewhere, if they could find a suitable place. Coming way up north of Nain has not been considered by anyone and would be far too far for these planes to come up and do any kind of beneficial training. So I would not worry about that.

Mr. Andersen asked if I knew what the percentage of flights might be over Quebec and over Labrador.

We do not look at things like that because, with respect to land claims or anything else -- and I am not going to get into that -- air space in Canada is controlled by the federal government, by Transport Canada, so, in a sense, it is federal air space. When we fly, we are not looking at a border between Quebec or Labrador, so we do not separate flying in one province more than another. It is just the area that is used there. So you could not give an answer to numbers to it, that kind of thing.

The areas we have established right now cover a little bit of Quebec and a little bit of Labrador and that is just the area that they do the low level flying in.

A little bit about the flights outside the area.

People must understand the areas that are on that map are areas where the planes can fly down to 100 feet. It is not illegal for them to fly outside of that area. They can fly as any civilian plane can; anywhere in Canada. They must obey those federal regulations that I spoke about. In unpopulated areas, particularly north of the 50th Parallel, aircraft can fly down to 250 feet.

Now, Colonel David in Goose Bay has, in an attempt to reduce as much disturbance as possible, put higher limitations on aircraft flying out of Goose Bay than actually exist with the federal government.

People have expressed their pride in the beauty of the landscape up here. I can assure you that is shared by the military people.

People coming from Europe, although there are very nice areas there as well, they appreciate the beauty here and in a sense, they are kind of like tourists. Some of them come up to Nain and into the Fraser Canyon taking pictures.

Now, we try -- I mentioned that military co-ordination centre -- we try as much as possible to control the pilots. We tell them: If you are going to fly near communities, or if you are going to fly outside of those areas, you have to try and stay at a certain altitude.

Now, we tell them that. We do not sit in the airplanes with them. Once in a while they are going to go below that. We are trying to improve the situation that Mr. Brown spoke about, where the aircraft came up here.

We looked into that particular situation and found that the aircraft had not told the co-ordination centre they were coming up here.

Now, that happens from time to time and we want to try and reduce that. So, please be assured that we have your interests at heart and we try and control this kind of thing.

We want the people to be able to go back to Europe and talk about the beauty of this country and to take pictures back but we encourage them to do it sensibly and not bother people.

The concern about jobs, I am going to refer to another base we have in Canada called Cold Lake. I will refer to it with a couple of things here.

This base has been in existence for over 20 years, well over 20 years. The air space they have for training there is about one-tenth of the size of the area we use right now. Yet, they have between 120 and 150 aircraft that fly there on a regular basis, using weapons and all sorts of things.

A portion of that area is very limited in access to hunters. What has resulted in the Cold Lake training area has become almost like a game reserve. There are, in fact, very large numbers of animals there, to the point that they are now bringing hunters in to try and cull some of the populations.

It is that kind of thing that we look at and, because it has gone on for so long there, that we feel that the effects on the animals will not be as great as people fear but that will come out in the studies. We are not making any judgments yet.

Cold Lake, there is an Indian reservation very close to Cold Lake. A lot of the people work at the base, about 10 per cent of the work force of the Cold Lake Base are from the Indian community.

The concerns about the jobs going to the local people of Goose Bay because the Inuit or the Innu will not have the training; I can understand how people feel about that but I know that many of the young people, particularly nowadays, are getting better education and better training

12-B-19

opportunities than perhaps their parents were able to get. There is no reason whatsoever why people, the Aboriginal people, cannot go and apply for the jobs, the same as anybody else.

If there is a special kind of training to be done, I know they are going to try and set up courses in Goose Bay at the community centre, so people can come and get the training to be able to give the local people an opportunity to apply for these jobs.

A concern about the disappearance of animals and the caribou.

I will quote someone that I think you people respect as an authority on caribou, Mr. Stuart Luttich. He has done a great deal of work, as you know, with the caribou in Labrador.

We were discussing just last week, I think it was, or two weeks ago, about how the George River Herd, as it is called, has increased so tremendously in numbers. I find it very amazing myself and I do not know the reasons why. I suspect it is just nature.

I do not share comments made by people who suggest that the jets have something to.do with that increase in numbers. I do not think that that is sensible to make comments like that, either. Nature is what is involved there.

But the numbers have increased in 20-some years from about 15,000/20,000 to over 600,000 animals, and that is from the people that are the authorities. That is not a military figure.

Now, animals move around and I appreciate that. Some people may perceive that the jets cause that.

Once again, we hope that the studies will give some evidence about those things.

The caribou that have disappeared from the southern Labrador area; I have read studies done by specialists that indicate those herds started to decline and disappear long before there was any low flying and there seems to be an indication that, for example, it is over-hunting in a lot of cases down in those areas.

It was much easier to get to those herds for people down there but, again, I am not an authority. I am just quoting studies that exist.

I think that is about all I want to point out because I do understand the concerns, and those are some things that I could comment on.

Once again, if the Chairman is willing, I would be certainly more than happy to talk to anybody about anything at all that I could help with. I am here to help, not to give people a hard time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. This might be a good time for anybody to ask a question about the project while the Major is at the table.

Yes, Mr. Andersen?

MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN: I would like

to thank you. I would like to ask you one question, Major.

If, in your Environmental Impact Study, it shows that economic viability based on renewable resource industry for Labrador would be greater than that of the economic advantages from a military base, and, at the same time, if the military base was proven or the low level flying activity was proven that it would have detrimental effects on the resources, would NATO still go ahead with that base in Goose Bay?

MAJOR McCABE: Obviously, the kind of decision that would be made in that sort of thing would, I suspect, be a very high level one in the government, i.e., a political decision.

I would suggest -- and it is important that people understand -- I heard people today talk about their pride in being Canadians.

The Canadian Government is trying to get NATO to come in here, that is true, because they see certain benefits that would come from that.

They also have very much in their heart and in their minds the concerns of Canadians.

If this study comes out with evidence of significant harmful effects or detrimental effects on caribou or other forms of wildlife or, indeed, on the people, the government is not going to be able to ignore that because it must take the concerns of the Canadian people at heart.

Now, that is the whole reason why we are having this study. A lot of people think decisions will be made in December and this is all a waste of time.

The Minister of Defence has stated his concern and his aim that the recommendations and the findings of this Panel and of this study must be done and available before Canada commits itself to that NATO project.

Now, that is a government statement and I have to stand by that.

I do not know if that answer is enough, Mr. Andersen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, would you come forward to ask your question, please?

MS JUDY ROWELL: My name is Judy Rowell. I am with the LIA.

I just have two comments. One is in response to your comment about over-hunting being one of the major factors in the decrease of the southern caribou herds and I guess, in particular, the Mealy Mountain Herd. I am aware of the studies you are referring to but I would just like to add one other fact.

That is, there is also undocumented evidence, or, at least, undocumented statements, that there was relatively large-scale killing from aircraft by military personnel.

Now, the problem is that this is

not documented. So I would just like to suggest to the Panel that, in reviewing the evidence on these issues, that you consider your documented scientific evidence, as well as empirical evidence and the kind of statements that people might be able to give but may not in fact be documented.

So that is one comment.

The other comment I would like to make is on this caribou study that we hear a lot of reference to. This is the study that is being funded jointly by the federal government and the province to look at the impacts of low flying aircraft on the caribou.

I want to be a little bit careful here about how I say what I want to say, but we have completed the first field season of that study and I would like to know, firstly, if you are aware of the problems with the co-operation and co-ordination of the military over-flying of the caribou herds related to the field work.

MAJOR McCABE: I am aware of some of the problems that have come up and there are two reasons for that.

First of all, we must remember that these planes belong to other countries, they are not Canadian.

We are trying to get them to co-operate in the study. Because of all of the concerns that have been expressed in Europe about the problems of airplanes over-flying caribou, these peopl have been told--ordered--in no uncertain terms in their home country that: Before you come to Labrador, you will not over-fly caribou. We are having a real problem there because we are trying to get them to co-operate but they are trying so much to ensure that they do not get involved with harming the caribou or the allegations made that way.

So we have a bit of a paradox there, and it is unfortunate because they are the people that will benefit if we can prove that there are no effects.

We are trying to rectify that situation, improve it.

The other problem is that the caribou, the control animals, the animals that have the special collars on, as I have been informed about this, there is a delay in getting the information on where the animals are located because it is done by satellite and it is a very roundabout way the information comes back.

By the time they get that information to the aircraft to go out and fly, those animals have moved. I believe the Panel has been briefed on this as well. It can be as much as a 24-hour delay.

That presents difficulties for the researchers and it presents difficulties for the aircraft.

You can also imagine the difficulty of trying, because there is only a certain number of animals that have these collars on, it is kind of difficult for an aircraft to find a single caribou or the ones that they are trying to fly over to get the information. It is a difficult task.

So, again, we have modern technology that is being used in a study but we have a problem with a basic transfer of information.

We are trying to work towards improving that. I am certainly aware of the problems there.

MS ROWELL: Okay. I just wanted, first of all, to check to see if you were aware, apart from the other problems, of the problems relating to the co-operation and co-ordination of all the forces that were flying, not just CAF.

But the bottom line of that is that we may not have any reliable data from this field season, which means we have one year left on the study and, assuming that that is problem-free, which is really optimistic, I am not sure at all that we are going to be very much closer to getting any more answers on the questions that we have now than we are today.

So what I would like to say to the Panel is that, in the Guidelines, and we will deal with this in our more specific comments on the Guidelines but I think that you should be aware that this study is not likely to provide all the answers that I think people often assume it will.

As a result, the Guidelines should recognize this, should recognize the importance of this issue and should try to address the need for the proponent to deal with specific contingencies for getting the data and not just identify the fact that it is a data gap and that it is an important gap, but must direct the proponent in the EIS to deal with a contingency that accounts for such a major data deficiency.

That is it for my comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Does anybody else have a question for the Major about the project? Yes, would you come forward, please?

MS SHARON EDMUNDS: Sharon Edmunds, Advisor to LIA. LIA has asked the Department of National Defence for its comments on the Draft Guidelines. We would like to know where DND, as the proponent, has problems or needs clarification on the Draft Guidelines as they are?

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, I am aware of this request that has been put to DND. The section that is the primary department of responsibility is our Department of Conservation and Environment within National Defence. As you know, Miss Edmunds, Mr. Tony Downs is the Director. In fact, I was sitting in his office when he spoke to you on the phone and he has assured you that he will give you a response in writing as well.

Although recognizing that we have a formidable task ahead of us, in responding in what we hope is an acceptable manner to the Guidelines -- because, I might add, this is the first time National Defence has gone through this process, so we are very interested in ensuring that it is done properly. There is nothing in there really that we see anything that needs, to my understanding, specific clarification or something that we are very uncomfortable with; not at this stage. There may be some things in there which, as we interpret the Guidelines, says we can comment on or change with the permission of the Panel. I think those really apply to things which we just may not be able to give as much detail as is requested or as is hoped for. I refer here to, for example, the NATO centre. The detail that might be required in some of the things just does not exist; therefore, it would be impossible to give.

I do not -- to my knowledge, there is nothing of major concern in there. I know we need some advice, I suppose, and this will be done during the study, on the reference to predicting the effect of this program or the proposals on the negotiations, the outcome of land claims negotiations. That is something I do not know how they are going to handle. One the one hand, we are not supposed to be involved -- the Panel, in fact, is not supposed to be involved with land claims negotiations, yet the land claims is coming up time and time again and I know is an area of concern.

I am not in a position to answer enough, obviously, what our response is going to be on that. It is something, because it is in the Guidelines, we are going to have to address but that will be done by people more qualified than myself.

MS EDMUNDS: Will that be done, then, before the final Guidelines are given to the proponent?

MAJOR McCABE: In talking to Mr. Downs, it is my understanding that we will proceed with the Guidelines as presented to us in their formal or final form. I think that if we had serious concern with some aspect of the Guidelines, we would have commented on them before now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. William Andersen would like to say something else. Please, go ahead, sir.

MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN: I have one more question of Major McCabe, Mr. Chairman.

You mentioned that some of the low level flying or fighter pilots come down low to take photographs. First of all, I do not understand how they can get good photographs from an aircraft travelling at over 600 miles per hour. Secondly, I think you know if military personnel are interested enough in this area to come and photograph it, there is a much better way of doing it. I wonder if there could be some guidelines put in to military personnel. It does not cost a heck of a lot of money for them to come up on a coastal boat or a passenger plane and travel with some local people here. Local people, to my knowledge, have not had any opposition to bringing someone out to do photography. I do not see any opposition to that. Why could they not do that rather than come down and frighten the heck out of everybody, plus perhaps do real damage to the renewable resources that we rely on.

MAJOR McCABE: You are combining two things in there by asking -- which I think is a very fair comment and I think a good suggestion -- about people coming up here in the form of tourists or whatever you might want to call it. I know the provincial government is very interested in promoting tourism of a general nature in Labrador. Many of the local civilian operators in Goose Bay, for example, I think looked forward to the opportunity to fly people around into the interior.

I would suggest possibly it needs more promotion to let people know of the kind of things that they can do, that they could take advantage of. Again, that is not my area of expertise but I do share your interest there in people coming up and doing some photography on the ground. I think it is an excellent idea. Having come here, my first visit today, I certainly have been very impressed by what I saw.

I also might add that I am a fighter

pilot myself and I have taken many pictures around the world at 500 or 600 miles an hour and they come out quite nice. It is possible. But I would say that they do not do it at 100 feet because you are very busy with trying to fly the airplane at that level.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a lady there who would like to ask a question. Please, come forward.

MS BARBARA KITOWSKI: To step up national defence and to increase military power in the north of Canada last year, I think it was decided to renew the facility at Saglek. So, whenever you say that there is no possibility of a sea weapons practice area north, then I would ask you: Would it not be possible for the planes to refuel at Saglek?

MAJOR McCABE: Definitely not. The only -- I am really not sure whether there is a final decision on Saglek or not, but I assume that you are referring to the North Warning System which is an upgrading modernization of the whole radar northern warning system, which is the one that exists right now, The old DEW line, the CADIN Pine Tree Line. There is very antiquated equipment and there is a lot of gaps in it. They are trying to improve that. What we are looking at radar facilities, not training bases or bases which could handle fighter aircraft now. On that point there are some areas called forward operating locations which are being looked at across Canada. Some, for example, that come to mind -- again, I think the final decision on the creation of those is about to be released in the next few weeks, in fact. They are looking at Frobisher Bay, Kuujjuaq, Inuvik, places like that as being areas where airfields exist right now and there would be some modest expansion or upgrading that would be required to handle fighter aircraft. Those would come in periodically for a few days at a time, usually, a small number of them. But there is certainly no discussion whatsoever of developing a place like Saglek into an airfield.

MS KITOWSKI: Also, it occurred to me a little strange when you said that a lot of the flying which is supposed to take place in a certain area, the jets still go outside that area or they fly at levels which are not legal, that you try to control that. I can appreciate that. I can understand how it is whenever you have a bunch of young pilots who are sort of doing macho work and very important work. I think it is hard to control them and it is probably exciting work for them, but if it is occurring now and there are difficulties controlling it, I can only imagine what it is going to be in the future with an increase in the number of aircraft. There will be quite a few more unauthorized flights taking place. I do not really see that anybody can do anything about that. That is just part and parcel of the whole thing here, of what we are talking about, increased military activity, such unpleasant activities.

To go over again, when I was at the Fraser River Canyon, the jets came very low. I do not know if they were 100 feet off the water but they looked like they were down -- almost down on the river. That makes it very frightening, too, because you just get very startled by it. As we climbed up out of the canyon and onto the barrens -- it took three days, but we heard the jets again. We did not see them but we heard them down in the canyon. So, from what other people say, it seems to be a fairly common practice.

MAJOR McCABE: I appreciate that it is perceived as a common practice. We, again, are aware of the attraction of the Torngat Mountains, the Fraser Canyon. It is because of that increased awareness that we are trying to do more about it. I do not share your suggestion that there are frequent violations of this low level. We spend a lot of money training these people and some people may perceive it as a macho occupation or whatever, but those machines that they fly cost millions of dollars, they can kill them in a matter of a fraction of a second and they fly them very professionally normally. There are cases, will be cases once in a while, where people are going to maybe not stick quite to the letter of the law. The majority of the times when people come up flying outside those areas, they are going to fly at or above the altitudes that they are permitted to fly at.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

There is a gentleman at the back who would like to speak, I believe.

MR. ABA KOJAK: When you are talking about wildlife, it is not only caribou you are talking about. As I was saying earlier, there is very little that we can make money at but in the wintertime there is a few things like foxes and what-not that we make a bit of money on, but we also use a lot of money to try to get into this field. At this time, too, we are making a little bit of money on the caribou. I just wanted to mention that because I had said earlier it was only fish that we made money on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that information, sir.

I believe, if there are no more questions, nobody else who wishes to speak at this time, that this may be the time to bring the meeting to a close.

On behalf of the Panel I would like to thank you all for coming to the meeting. I would like to thank the people of Nain for making us feel very welcome here. Thank you to all of you who have come forward to speak to us. I would also like to thank the Town Council and the Labrador Inuit Association for helping us by spreading information to the people about the project and about why the Panel was coming here before we came because I believe that work has made our job here much easier. It has prepared people to come and speak to us and we certainly have heard from a great many people here today.

This is also my first visit to Nain and I am looking forward to coming back again. I have been Makkovik before but I had not been as far north as this. So, I am very favourably impressed.

Thank you again and please maintain your interest in this project. We will look forward to coming back here again at the next round of meetings. Goodnight.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Volume

15

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	DAVIS INLET	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 29, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	15	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Nukum Mani Shan School, Davis Inlet

DATE: October/octobre 29, 1986.

VOLUME: 15

I N D E X

PAGE

Introduction by The Chairman 1711

Presentation by Major McCabe 1716

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Mary Jane Nui 1720
William Katshinak 1723
Chief Cajetan Rich 1724
William Katchinak 1726
Chief Cajetan Rich 1729
Martha Piwas 1734
George Gregoire 1734
George Rich 1743
Father Jim MacDonald 1745
Bert Saunders 1752
Louis Byrne 1756

* * * * *

---Upon Commencing at 11:10 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of Davis Inlet. My name is David Barnes. I work for the Government of Canada and I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel.

This Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of proposed military flying activities based at Goose Bay and extending over parts of Labrador and Quebec.

I would like to introduce the other members of the Panel to you. Beginning at that end of the table, on your left, is Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart was formerly employed with the Canadian Armed Forces. He was stationed at Goose Bay for several years. He now lives in Ottawa where he operates a small farm.

Next is Mr. Tim Northcott. Mr. Northcott is a biologist who lives in St. John's. He has extensive experience with wildlife in Newfoundland and Labrador and he operates a company which is a consulting firm in environmental matters.

On my right is Mr. Tim McNeill. Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business. He has been appointed to this Panel because he is very knowledgeable about the interests and the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

At my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs in that area and also has been involved in business interests in that community. Before his retirement, Mr. Jourdain worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is also a biologist. He works extensively with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He was involved with the negotiation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement and still involved, in fact, in the implementation of that Agreement. He lives in Montreal where he operates a consulting firm.

I work at the Environmental Review Office of the Government of Canada in Ottawa. I have been there about one year and before that I worked for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the Department of Environment.

Our Panel has been asked to examine the proposed military flying activities and to determine what the environmental effects of those activities might be and to recommend to the Government of Canada whether or not these activities should be allowed to proceed.

In order to do that, this Panel will be asking the Department of National Defence, which is the Department responsible for this project, to write a large report which will be called an Environmental Impact Statement.

In that report National Defence will

describe their project, they will talk about what environmental effects they expect to be caused by the project and they will propose certain measures to deal with those effects. By that I mean they will propose measures which might improve any benefits coming from the project and also measures to offset the seriousness of any undesirable effects that might come from the project.

In order to make sure that National Defence covers all of the important subjects, all of the important issues in that report, the Panel must give it instructions. Those instructions will be contained in a document called Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

That brings us to the reason why the Panel is here in Davis Inlet today and why we have been holding meetings in many locations in Labrador and Quebec. We are holding these meetings to ask people like yourselves what you feel about the preliminary or Draft Guidelines document that the Panel published in August of this year and distributed to your community and to all of the others.

When all of these meetings are over, that will be at the end of October, the Panel will think very carefully about all of the information that has been presented to it in these meetings and will decide how the Guidelines document should be improved.

When the Guidelines are ready in their

final form the Panel will present the Guidelines to the Department of National Defence and we hope to be able to do that in December of this year.

The Department of National Defence will then begin to prepare this Environmental Impact Statement and when it is finished they will present it to the Panel. We expect that that might happen sometime in the summer of 1987.

When the Panel receives that report it will make it available to anyone who is interested. So that, while the Panel is examining that report from National Defence, the people in the various communities like Davis Inlet will be able to examine it also. There will be a period of several months for that examination of the Environmental Impact Statement.

When the Panel is sure that the Environmental Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is when it feels that the report contains everything that was required in the Guidelines, the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings. They will be a little like this hearing that we are holding today, except a little more formal. In those hearings we will talk with the people of the communities about the Environmental Impact Statement and about the project.

When those hearings are over we come to the final step of the Review and that is when the Panel writes its own report to the Government of

Canada saying how the Panel feels about the project, how it feels about the environmental effects and whether it feels that the project is acceptable from an environmental point of view.

The Panel believes that it may be ready to present its report to the Government of Canada sometime late in 1987 or early in 1988.

I hope that gives you a brief idea of what this Review is all about and what the Panel is trying to do. We could try to answer some questions later, if you like. Perhaps you would like to think about some questions that you might like to ask about this process.

At this time I would like to apologize for the fact that our visit to Davis Inlet is going to be very short. We have two other communities that we have to visit this week and we have to leave this afternoon at a time that is determined by the company that runs the airline.

I have kept my remarks short so that we can leave as much time as possible to hear from the people in Davis Inlet. We know we have several people who want to speak to us today. I would like to explain that we will have to break for lunch at about 12:30. That is the time when lunch is going to be provided to the Panel. I am not sure what time we are going to begin again. I wonder, could somebody tell me what time we plan to start again this afternoon? I will find out before we break.

With that apology, we will go on with the rest of the meeting.

The Panel feels that it is very important for everyone to understand exactly what this military project is; what is this project that the Panel has been asked to review. In order to provide you with information on the project, we have invited here today a representative of the Department of National Defence. I would ask him to stand and show himself to you. He is Major David McCabe.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of Davis Inlet. As the Chairman has said, because we are short of time, I also will try to keep my comments very short and very straight forward. I will answer any questions, if there are things that are not understood, after I have finished the talk.

Goose Bay Airport was built by the military in 1941 and has had military activity ever since that time. At its peak level of activity in the 1960s there were nearly 12,000 military people and their families living in Goose Bay. Today the military air force or military aircraft of four countries use Goose Bay: The United States, Canada, Germany and Great Britain.

I will talk a little bit about what these countries do. Canada looks after the radar at Goose Bay and also looks after the base rescue helicopter flight. As well, Canada runs an office called the Military Co-ordination Centre. I will talk a little bit more about that in a minute. Germany and Great Britain are the two countries that are doing most of the low level flying, which is probably what most people are familiar with. These aircraft practice their flying in two special areas which are marked on a map behind me. In those areas they can go very low, as much as 100 feet above the ground.

The last country I just mentioned is the United States. The United States used to have a lot of people in Goose Bay. Now they have a very small group which looks after the American military airplanes that come in to get fuel as they fly to Europe. One of the responsibilities of the Military Co-ordination Centre that I mentioned is to control all local military flying. Each time an airplane flies in those two training areas, they must let the Co-ordination Centre know where they are going to fly.

When the pilots come in to file their flight plan to show the route they are going to fly, the Canadian military show the pilots where there are fishing and hunting camps and also they try to show them where there might be large groups of animals like caribou and they tell the pilots to avoid these, not to go near them.

I now want to talk about the two proposals that the Chairman mentioned. The first one is an increase, a proposed increase in the kind of flying that is done right now. That is the countries want to do more flying and also some other countries would like to start flying in Goose Bay as well.

The other proposal is a plan to build a large training centre for pilots where they can conduct all kinds of military training. This proposal, this plan is called the NATO Fighter Weapons Training Centre. There are two countries who have offered locations for this training centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and the country of Turkey has also offered an air base.

I am going to give you a few numbers now just to give an idea of the level of activity that might come if this centre is built in Goose Bay. It is planned to have as many as 136 airplanes flying up to 200 flights a day. This training would go on for about 40 weeks of the year, about 10 months of the year. Every two weeks about 1,500 military people would come into Goose Bay to train at this centre. To help these people carry out their activities, there would be about 1,700 people who would come in to live in Goose Bay for two to three years, to help to support their training. The types of training that will be carried out might be a little difficult to understand, so I will try to make them as simple as possible.

First of all, there would be some training like the type that is done now, low level training. As well, aircraft would practice at other altitudes, at medium and high altitudes, very high, like, sometimes we see the jets flying away, high up in the sky. They would be practicing what is called air combat, fighting each other. There would also be a requirement to practice or train for using weapons from the airplanes. This would include practice weapons which do not explode -- we use those right now -- and also would include possibly some live weapons, some real bombs that do explode.

There is a possibility that an area out at the sea in the water might be identified where airplanes can practice fighting against military ships. I will answer any questions about -- more detailed questions about this training after, if there are any questions.

I want now just to finish off by talking about employment opportunities. With the proposed increases, there will probably be a great deal of construction in the area. Because of all the people who had come into Goose Bay, we would need things like houses, hangars for the aircraft, recreational facilities and possibly an extra runway.

As well as construction, once the centre is built, then there would be some jobs or some employment opportunities for the day to day activity, the operational running of the centre.

The last area that possibly there might be some employment of various types would be in the local community. Businesses, possibly new businesses would come in or some of the businesses that exist right now would have to expand a little bit to be able to handle all the new people.

I think that is really all I should present at this time, Mr. Chairman. I thank you very much and I would be ready for any questions, with the Chairman's permission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major McCabe.

In order to make sure that you understand what the project is, I would encourage you not to ask any questions that you may have about the project. If anyone would like to ask a question I would ask you to come forward and stand at the microphone at the front of the room and would you please give your name before you ask your question.

Would anybody like to come and ask a question?

MS MARY JANE NUI: When the first military activity started in 1941, were the Innu people ever asked if they agreed to this military activity when they first built the base in Goose Bay?

MAJOR McCABE: I really could not answer if they were asked back in those days. I know, from what we have heard in our visits to communities, apparently many of the Innu people worked at Goose Bay for the construction and worked at North West River. I do not know whether they were actually asked what they thought about it.

MS NUI: There is now not much use in talking to a Panel or anyone when people here -- the military just took the land from the people without asking.

MAJOR McCABE: It has been over 50 years since Goose Bay was built. It was built during wartime. Many, many things have changed in our society and the way we do things. We want to do things better, we want to talk to the people now about the future. That is why we are here.

MS NUI: In the last world war, in the Second World War, people just came and took what they wanted. Now, the younger kids -- there is better education than there was before. It is those young people who are trying to take the land away from their culture and traditional ways.

MAJOR McCABE: I understand the change and the concern that the people have now about their land and it is my understanding that the Innu, as well as the Inuit, are talking with the various governments to come to agreements about that land. That is something that is outside of the military operation.

MS NUI: Most of those young people were brought up in the country and most of those young mothers certainly do not feel right if a jet flys over and frightens young kids. Those young mothers will not feel too good about it.

MAJOR McCABE: I understand that and that is why we have asked the people to try to let us know when they are going to go to their camps in the country. I think usually they go more or less to the same areas. When we know there is somebody there we are able to let the pilots know to stay away from the camps. I know that the Chief of the Council, Cajetan Rich, has spoken with Colonel David to let him know where these camps are and we try to avoid them.

MS NUI: There are a few people out in the country at this time of the year and they have been getting reports from the people out there that are seeing and hearing planes close to their camps and nearby.

MAJOR McCABE: What we try to do is to not fly over the camps. We put a circle of five miles around the camp to try to avoid it. People may still hear the planes or may still see them but we try to avoid flying right over top. Just for information, the flying season has finished about a week ago, so there would be no more low flying until March or April of next year.

MS NUI: I cannot understand why the military are flying over land that they never signed over to any government. I cannot understand why the military have taken over the land.

MAJOR McCABE: The military has not taken over the land. We fly in the air above the land, that is true. As I mentioned earlier, the discussion of who owns the land, who has the right to the land is going on between the Native people and the governments, that is not a military affair.

MS NUI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else like to ask a question? Would you please give your name.

MR. WILLIAM KATSHINAK: My name is William Katshinak. I think I can explain this instead of having it translated from my own language.

I would like to mention to the Major that before the military started in Goose Bay for low flying levels, there should be meetings starting in the area first. They should have started away back before now. They have been flying over the land for the past few years now. We are hurt that there were no meetings held and nothing has been happening. I think it is too late for you guys that came around here. You are doing to our land what has been done in the past.

People were not advised that there would be military flying in the area in Labrador where people are hunting. I can tell the Major -- he says he wants us to draw a guideline of where the people are staying in the country and about five miles away. Why should we give them guidelines. This is our own land. We are living off our land and we have not right to give them a guideline of land of where we are staying in the country.

MAJOR McCABE: If I could just make a response there and possibly you could translate it or this gentlemen. It is important to understand that the military is part of the government. It is a government policy or government interpretation of land usage. That is the government's business, the departments to discuss the kind of things you are talking about. Until some agreement takes place, then the military will continue to fly but we want to try to protect the people. That is why we are asking. We are not demanding; we are asking people to let us know so we can avoid them. There is a lot of space out there.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are people who have presentations to make to the Panel, so I would like to keep any other questions until a little later. We have about 15 minutes left before we have to go to lunch. I understand that the Band Council, which was to be our first speaker, wishes to speak for approximately half an hour. So, there will not be time for all of that before lunch.

CHIEF CAJETAN RICH: Could we do the presentation this afternoon because I have some questions. I guess the other people have some questions, too, do they?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have three other speakers for this afternoon. We have to leave at three o'clock I understand.

CHIEF CAJETAN RICH: What I am saying is we would not have any time for any long presentations this afternoon. I guess most of them are quite long and they may need interpretation at the same time, so it might take a while.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have some more

questions now, if you have some questions.

CHIEF RICH: I have some questions here for your Panel and the Major. After these environmental things, when you finally come to the conclusion that it is a health hazard to the people and the environment, what is going to happen on the military thing who are, at the same time, out there promoting this military thing for Labrador? I heard they are negotiating with the Netherlands now. What is going to happen on their part if the Environmental Review Panel decides that it is a health hazard to the community or to the people?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe there are two parts to the answer to your question.

CHIEF RICH: There are two parts, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will speak on behalf of the Panel. What the Panel will do is that it will look at all of the information it receives during this review and will decide whether it believes there are serious environmental effects or effects on people that might happen. Then, it will make a report to the government recommending whether or not these military activities should be allowed to go ahead. That is all that the Panel can do. After that, it is the decision of the Government whether those activities go on. Perhaps Major McCabe would like to give a second part to that answer.

MAJOR McCABE: I just want to start -- you said "when" the Panel finds. I should say, as the

Chairman said, "if" this study shows that there are serious problems, then the Government has to make a decision on what to do with the activity if the study shows serious effects on the people and the environment.

MR. KATSHINAK: I ask a question to the Panel, I think. Were there any studies done on the impact of the military low flying on the animals or the people?

THE CHAIRMAN: There have been some studies done in past years on the behaviour of the caribou, for example. Those studies were not designed to tell the effects of low level flying on the caribou but they do provide some information which will help us to determine what those effects might be. There was a report in 1981 prepared by National Defence which did not involve any new studies at that time, it looked at the results of the older studies, and that report said that the Department of National Defence did not believe that low level flying activities would cause harm to wildlife or to people.

Perhaps Major McCabe would like to say something further on that.

MAJOR McCABE: All I want to add is that, although specific studies may not have been done here in Goose Bay, we do have training areas in other parts of the country that have existed for much longer or have done training of the type done here for much longer than in Goose Bay. It is because of our experience with those places that we feel the effects, if any, are very small.

MR. KATSHINAK: I want to know about the low level flying -- planes flying solo. Is that the way they are going to fly all the time if they are going to attack someone?

MAJOR McCABE: That is a difficult question to answer. They are training that way because those particular airplanes would probably use that technique of low flying to be able to get to their target to avoid being picked up by radar. So, those planes would use that kind of flying, yes.

MR. KATSHINAK: I feel that if there is any military activity taking place in the world, they know we have to rely on the military and they know there is a certain noise when someone is flying directly over you. The thunder is a little more loud than the jet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any other questions, sir?

MR. KATSHINAK: I have been in Goose Bay before, I have been there a lot of times and I never felt any ill effects on the noise of the jets since he has seen them.

MAJOR McCABE: I thank him for his comment. I do understand that when people live near an airport they become used to the noise because it is there more often. I can understand peoples' concerns in the country where the jets do not come very often and it is very quiet. I understand that concern and that is why we try to know where people are so we can keep the noise down.

MR. KATSHINAK: The only fears I have of the low level flying jets is when they are flying to Goose Bay and one of them hitting a passenger plane or whatever.

MAJOR McCABE: Again, I understand that concern. There are many places in Canada, as you can imagine, where there are many, many more planes than here. These pilots are trained to keep an eye open, to look for other airplanes and we will do our best to avoid that kind of thing happening, obviously.

THE CHAIRMAN: With your permission, I think we would like to break for lunch now. We will take one hour, so we will begin again at 1:30 and I would ask you please to be back here right on time at 1:30 so we can begin the scheduled presentations, beginning with the Band Council.

Thank you very much for coming and we will see you once again at 1:30.

---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

---Upon Resuming at 1:30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to begin the meeting, so I would ask you to sit down, please.

We will now begin to hear scheduled presentations from various interested groups here in Davis Inlet. We will begin first with the Band Council. Would the speaker please come forward to the table and go ahead whenever he is ready.

---SUBMISSION BY CHIEF CAJETAN RICH:

CHIEF RICH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, Panel. My name is Cajetan Rich, Chief of this community, Davis Inlet. On behalf of this community, I would like, first of all, to welcome you all. It is the first time in history that such a Panel has come to our village to listen to some of our views and concerns in regard to low level flying and the possibility of a NATO base at Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

I agree with the Band Council that such a Panel should have been appointed before all this low level flying proceeded. An example was set a few years ago when uranium was discovered at nearby Postville. A Panel such as this was appointed. It listened to interested groups regarding the possible health hazards to local people, wildlife and the environment. Their findings revealed it might lead to health hazards and so the uranium mine was not started. This is one of the examples of how the government panels work to protect the people and the environment. I would like to recommend that the federal and provincial governments investigate conditions thoroughly before they started ventures that might endanger the environment and its people.

Low level flying has been going on for the last several years. At first it did not affect the migration of caribou but, as years go by, most of our hunters have started to notice changes in the

Rich, Sub.

migration patterns.

When we questioned the wildlife biologist, we were told that there were too many caribou and they have eaten most of the food in the areas where they used to be, so they have to change their migration in order to find food elsewhere. We were not satisfied with the answer from the wildlife biologist because we know and we have seen the caribou mass is plentiful in that part of the country and that there was food enough.

Another strange migration was the moose. Before I never heard my grandfather mention anything about moose being here. Moose have never been found as far north on the coast as Davis Inlet, where in the last few years most anyone from the village has seen moose. Tracks have been seen and moose have been sited at Sandy Lake and around the Flowers Bay area. Now, if we were to confront the wildlife biologist about this strange migration of moose, are we also going to be told that there are lots of moose and they have eaten most of their food in the Lake Melville area and have been forced to move here? We think the answer to that strange migration of moose is that they have been driven away from their homeland because of disturbance created by the low level flying.

This brings me to another concern. Who is out there protesting on the behalf of the wildlife; nobody. So, when we say the Innu are against the low

Rich, Sub.

level flying, remember always to include the wildlife because we know for a fact that the wildlife are disturbed because of the noise and the smoke coming out of the jets.

Sure, there are lots of birds laying eggs on the coast of Labrador but, do not forget, there are many birds laying eggs in the interior of this land. Examples are geese, loons, partridges and other small birds. They are out there doing something and giving birth to their little ones. The same thing goes for foxes, rabbits, minks, otters and muskrats. We should not forget these animals that are giving birth in the interior of these lands. The animals and birds are hurt as much as we are, but they are the ones who suffer the most because they cannot show their feelings to anyone.

With reference to the map you have drawn up, we have some concerns in area 1 and area 1A. Areas 1 and 1A is our hunting ground now and has been for the last 100 years. Areas 1 and 1A are also a calving ground for the caribou. People from all over still travel back and forth to hunt, fish and trap in this area. Most of the people were born in that area and is where we were educated in our own tradition. We were taught how to survive and live in any kind of threatening weather. We have been taught where to find food and when to expect caribou to be back there in winter. We were also taught what to do in cases of

Rich, Sub.

emergency. We learned all this expertise from our grandfathers. Now we are trying to pass it on to our children. We do not want to lose any of it.

Now we see our land as a possible place where war practices are going on and that is a threat to our way of life and our culture. At the moment we cannot be sure whether plant life and water is affected or not, but that is something that we should be working on to see if there are any strange appearances in the trees, flowers or other plants.

The vibration and the smoke coming out of the jet motors have some affect on the land. It is early at this stage to see if they are affected or not but, like I said before, it is something to look into.

Before the decision is made whether or not the NATO base should be located at Goose Bay, we must consider all the possible effects on civilians, the community and its surroundings. Sure, there would be an economic boost in the area of Lake Melville, but the only ones that would benefit would be the businesses of Happy Valley-Goose Bay. There will be thousands of military personnel coming into the Town of Goose Bay who know nothing about or care little about the Innu people. I am worried about the physical harm that could be done to the Innu because we could be regarded as their enemies.

Some of these questions have to be

Rich, Sub.

answered first: Will civilians lose their jobs? So far I have heard that jobs are lost because the military has taken over. Would these be brought in that will affect the local people? Would the military establish missile targets in Labrador? Would there be nuclear testing done in our area? The questions could go on and on without any specific answers.

Finally, I am afraid that the Innu people could be seen as enemy by the military because of our fight for our land. Our fight is not with the military but with the Government of Canada which does not recognize the fact that we are the masters of our house. We have never surrendered our land or signed any treaties with any government. We consider ourselves as the owners of this land. The military are renting our house but are not paying its owners. 8A Instead, they are paying the federal government for it.

Millions and millions of dollars have been made from the use of our land and, yet, we are still a Canada-opposed family. We want the federal and provincial governments to recognize our rights to this land.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Chief Rich.

Next, we will hear from a person speakin on behalf of the Women's Group. If that speaker is ready, would she come forward please.

---SUBMISSION BY MARTHA PIWAS:

MS PIWAS: My name is Martha Piwas, President of the Davis Inlet Innu Women's Group. I would like to read to you a short brief report by the women of Davis Inlet.

People who live in the country do not like to hear and see the low level flying aircraft. Families with small children are afraid to hear them as they make a lot of noise. Expectant mothers would probably go in early labour from the unexpected loud noise and have premature babies in the country, or people with heart problems would suffer heart attacks from it.

People from outside Native communities do not go to live in the country for a long period, unlike the Innu. Therefore, they do not really know what it is like to to hear the aircraft roaring over their camps and disturbing the wildlife.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The next group that wishes to speak to us is the Alchohol Centre. Would the speaker for this group please come forward.

---SUBMISSION BY GEORGE GREGOIRE:

MR. GEORGE GREGOIRE: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. George Gregoire from the Alcohol Centre.

I have seen a lot of jets passing by in the country ever since the low level flying has been

Gregoire, Sub.

going on in Labrador. I also met with some people who were in the interior of Labrador to hunt, to trap, to live on the wild animals. They are saying that there were a lot of animals and lots of fish; now, there are only few. It is not because of overhunting, we think the low level flying has scared the animals away. We Innu people of Labrador know that the jets are frightening the animals away because we used to live in the country for many years and we have seen the animals disappear.

We also have seen the jets that are flying in the night below our camps, they are even frightening the small children. We do not even hear them once they are coming and suddenly a big noise hits when they are over the camp.

We Innu people of Labrador do not want any low level flying in our land. We want to save our wild animals that we live on for many years and for future use for our children and grandchildren. Some day there will be nothing left. We will be left with hunger. We do not have any money to buy food in stores. We do not live on anything that the government sell in the stores.

We know that there will be some jobs but we will never get the jobs that those white people will get. Those jobs will never benefit the Innu people of Davis Inlet.

We want to use our land the way we have

Gregoire, Sub.

survived for so many years. I was in Mistastin Lake this fall. We seen the jets passing there two or three times a day. We also could see the smoke coming out of the jets and smelled the smoke that comes out of the jets. The jets are killing our wildlife and polluting our lakes that we fish in.

This was from the alcohol worker, Etienne Pastiwet.

The low level flying has been in Labrador since 1977. What we get is nothing; instead, we have more problems because of low level flying. We never see any caribou with one big herd; instead, the caribou seem to move in all different directions. One thing we find different about the caribou is, once we see the caribou and shoot them, after the first shot they take off and that never happened before.

Now, the government talks about the NATO base in Goose Bay. The NATO base will not do any good to Innu people. They will only destroy our Innu culture and our way of life. Both provincial and federal governments has no right to tell the Innu people how they should live off their own land. The Innu people have survived thousands of years without low level flying or a NATO base. The Innu people have their own right to protect their own land and the wildlife in the country.

We have heard that in the near future the low level flying will practice in Labrador with

Gregoire, Sub.

live ammunitions. If that happens, will the Innu people still go back to the country as they did in the past? Some of the people who are now in the country told us they found some kind of bombs -- I do not know what kind of bombs. The ones they use to practice, I guess. The people in the country told us they found them. We told them, why did they not bring it up here and let Colonel David see them himself. Colonel David wants to know where the people are going to camp. I do not think there is any point telling Colonel David where we want to go and camp because Innu people know where the best places are to hunt or trap.

There are a few white people supporting Innu people against the low level flying but they just do not want to say it in public. I guess they do not want the government to hear this. Those people who support us against low level flying and the NATO base seem to know what our future problems are going to be, like, for example: There will be an increase of alcoholism, there will be more suicides, parents will lose their own children, our culture will be lost, there will be no place to hunt or trap for our children and grandchildren and the children yet to be born, all wildlife will be driven away, lakes will be polluted, fresh water fish will not be any good to eat, there will be increased health problems, elders will suffer because it is going to be hard to get wild meat or fish, and there will be all kinds of disease that will

Gregoire, Sub.

spread to our community. These are just a few things that are going to happen in Goose Bay is chosen for the NATO base. James Pasteen interviewed by Etienne Pastiwet, one of the elders in Davis Inlet.

I have seen caribou with some kind of disease like bad kidneys and liver. If low level flying continues in Labrador, more animals will be affected because of low level flying.

What I was told from the young hunters about the ways seems a lot different than in my days. I was told the caribou are wild and keep moving back and forth in many different directions. In my days, caribou used to move back and forth but never left the area where the feeding grounds were. Once it was time for breeding, the caribou used to migrate to the calving grounds. Another thing I find different about the caribou is the female caribou used to be fat all year round, now it is just a flesh of meat with no fat on it. It is not because of shortage of food, it is because the caribou keep moving and never have time to eat properly because the noise of the low level flying jets. The jets are killing the living things that we people depend on. This was from James Pasteen.

The government is trying to protect the animals and do not realize they are also killing the animals by letting the low level flying jets practice in the interior of Labrador. We as Innu people never waste any wild meat. We used to kill caribou when we

Gregoire, Sub.

needed them for our own food but we never killed more than we needed. For example, Innu people used to kill caribou for their own use as food and clothing. Now, for the sport hunters, they kill the caribou to have fun and waste the meat and for the antlers to keep as souvenirs. It is a shame to kill any wild animals when you do not need them. In the future many wild animals will die because of the low level flying. This was Etienne Pastiwet interviewing Joachim Tshakapesh.

If low level flying continues in Labrador Innu people will not be able to go back to the country. Why; because Innu people will never get used to that kind of noise. For example, if we were in the country today and if one of the women were pregnant, what would happen if she was alone? Suddenly the low flying jets pass by over her, the noise of the jets might damage her body, the unborn child may die and it would be like murder. If that happened today, for example, will the government take the military to the court or would the government just let it go without justice?

I used to be in the country with my family and I have seen these kinds of jets. They used to fly right to where we camp. That that time they used to fly only in the daytime, now they are flying at night, too.

Once we see the caribou and as we move closer to them, we do not hear the jets coming behind us. As they passed us, the caribou were frightened

Gregoire, Sub.

away and we never had a chance to shoot them. If it was not for the jets, we would have our caribou for our own food and our children who are in the camps expecting us to bring us some wild meat. I think in 10 or 20 years there will be nothing left in the country because those kinds of jets. The jets have polluted the feeding grounds and lakes. We as Innu people do not want to see our land destroyed. Our land is our only hope.

We have often heard on the news that the NATO base will create thousands of new jobs for Labradorians but that will not happen. Only people who are qualified to do the jobs will be hired. The Minister of Defence can say a lot of good things about the NATO base but once they settle the NATO base in Goose Bay they will forget all about the people in Labrador. Most militaries bring their own qualified people to work in Goose Bay. Very few Labradorians will be employed, if Goose Bay is chosen for the NATO base. The best jobs for the women will probably just be as a babysitter, they will babysit the military while the low level flying continues to destroy our wildlife in Labrador.

Now, for the government stores in coastal Labrador. In 10 years from now the things they sell in the stores will be very expensive. We will not be able to afford all the food we need. Take this, for example. If you had $50 in your pocket now, you might just have enough to buy one turkey but if you spent

Gregoire, Sub.

$50 worth of ammunition, you might have enough to buy two or three boxes of ammunition. From that three boxes of ammunition you might be able to get the kind of meat you need to last you for the whole year. This is the reason we want to protect our wild animals. We know we will need them and our children will need them in the future.

I think the people of Labrador should think in the future first before they make their own decisions. We Innu people have been mistreated in the past. Now it is time the government should listen to us. We are human beings, just as the other people. I think it is time the government consults the Innu people before it starts any development in our land.

The NATO base and low level flying will cause a lot of problems in the years to come, not only for the Innu people but also for the white people. I am sure there are a lot of things they have not told us about the NATO base and the low level flying, but once we see it we will know. Then it will be too late to do anything.

The government may think that only the people from Sheshatshit are concerned about low level flying. We people from Davis Inlet have to complain, too, because we have seen the low level flying from east of Border Beacon to the north and all the way to the north of Mistastin Lake. Once the caribou are gone from our hunting grounds, there will be no place

Gregoire, Sub.

for us to hunt or trap and our children and grandchildren will need this land for many more years to come.

We have heard on the news when the wildlife biologists have said that the George River herd will slowly disappear because of a shortage of food but we do not know whether it is true or not. If it is true, then we have to blame the government because each year caribou move further north because of the low level flying. There is a good place for feeding grounds in southern Labrador but caribou will not migrate there because of the noise of the jets and the gas that has dropped on the ground.

No matter what happens, we will never support the NATO base or low level flying. It is the animals we have to protect because in future both Innu and white people will need the wild animals for their own food. If low level flying continues in Labrador, they will surely destroy the wildlife, not only the animals but things that grow on the earth, like wild berries, caribou moss and other things that the animals eat.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, sir. Could I ask if you were speaking on behalf of the Northern Innu Health Council, as well as for the Alcohol Centre? Is that right?

So, there is nobody here right now to speak on behalf of the Health Council, is there?

While that speaker is getting ready, I

wonder if I could ask the speakers who have already been heard and the next speaker if the Panel could receive a copy of their presentation. It might be easier to help us understand all of the points made there. We try to make our meeting records as accurate as possible but it always helps to havea copy of the presentation, if that is possible. Thank you.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. GEORGE RICH:

MR. GEORGE RICH: My name is George Rich. The Band Council already presented their presentation to the Panel. At this stage, I want to say a few words to the Panel. You might have heard a lot of comments made by the Innu people towards the military flying activities in Labrador. You do not know who is to listen the most and who is to believe the most.

Just last week, on October 22nd, there was a documentary on The Journal on the low level flying and concerns of the Innu people of Labrador. The people claimed that they have flown over three times a day or maybe more. I want to know where that journalist got the information that he had heard at least once a month, as he had reported in The Journal.

Someone from the military base in Goose Bay claimed that the people in the camps had been flown over at least once a month. We have a lot of families in the country right now and they say they flown over their camps and they could hear the jets flying over the distance. Even if they were not flown over, they could hear the planes flying over

G. Rich, Sub.

distances.

Just recently we heard the report from one of the hunters who was flown over while he was in the middle of the lake. One of the hunters there had a health problem. Who is to blame?

We informed the Goose Bay base about the people who are in the country so they will not fly over their camps and they say they will not, they will try to control it. How will they control it if they have more and more jets coming here in Labrador with more jets coming and flying over?

Another thing I want the Panel to be aware of is those dummy bombs that have been found by the hunters in one of the countries -- in one of the camps in the country. What would happen if one of our people got hit by those so-called dummy bombs?

You also have certain bombing ranges. Would they be restricted to the Innus? If the NATO base is established in Goose Bay, how many acres of land would be restricted to all people?

I want to say one last thing, too. The only people who will benefit the most is the businessmen of Goose Bay and their close friends, not the local people of Goose Bay who thought they were represented by their community leaders. If more of the Goose Bay residents have more input into these issues and let them decide, not the businessmen of Goose Bay, then the government will probably propose the NATO base to

G. Rich, Sub.

Turkey.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Major McCabe, I wonder if you would care to respond to a question concerning the amount of land that might be excluded because of use as a practice weapons range? I believe that is what the gentleman was asking.

MAJOR McCABE: The existing range that we have right now that is marked on the map on the wall is not used by anyone for hunting or any other activity, it is in an area that is burnt out by a forest fire, it is marked by signs and it is quite small. I really do not know exactly how much area might be set aside for ranges in the future but those would have to be examined by all the people concerned, including the Innu.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is now a little after 2:30. We are able to stay for nearly another hour, if it is necessary and if there are people who would like to speak. We could hear questions, for example, or we could hear statements by anybody from the community who might like to say something to the Panel about this project and the review.

---SUBMISSION BY FATHER JIM MacDONALD:

FR. MacDONALD: My name is Jim MacDonald and I am the Pastor here.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Panel Members,

MacDonald, Sub.

ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to have the opportunity to address a few words concerning this Environmental Assessment Review and some of the issues that it raises.

The Environmental Assessment Panel's purpose of the review, it says, is a review of the proposed expansion of military activites in Labrador and Quebec. There are really, it seems to me, two issues. One is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which appears from all indications to be bound for Turkey; the second is the proposed expansion of the military low level flying activity over much of Labrador and Quebec. The words "low level", I note, are not used in the outline that has been set by your group.

The first issue would appear to be decided by the upcoming meeting of NATO Defence Ministers. So, I find the jobs employment argument would seem to me to be less significant. The ones proposing this job employment scenario are probably going to come out of this exercise very disappointed.

I believe that the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre is really a smokescreen attempt by the federal and provincial governments to create the euphoria of jobs, while the proposed expansion of military low level flying in Labrador and Quebec is the real interest and intent of both governments.

MacDonald, Sub.

Personally speaking, I am rather very proud of the positions taken by the Innu of Sheshatshit and the concerns raised by my confreres in the Ministerial Association. While we in Davis Inlet, both Innu and non-Innu, have not been as vocal on this issue, nevertheless our feelings are just as strong and we stand in solidarity with them. I think this has been pointed out by earlier speakers.

I would like to particularly highlight number 4 of the concerns raised by the Ministerial Association, and it says:

> "In Labrador we have a rich heritage of various peoples living and working together. Can we draw upon this shared history as today all face challenges to their way of life. For example, the Innu have never surrendered their Aboriginal lands and they see in governments' actions a failure to recognize their rights as a people. How are we to respond sensitively to the Innu of Labrador and Quebec who see the current militarization plans as a direct threat to their self-determination, environment and culture?"

This is a quote from "The Land is not For Sale". It says:

> "The land and what it means to Indians,

MacDonald, Sub.

Inuit and Métis is almost indefinable to the North American mind."

You, as an non-Innu Panel, and I, as a non-Innu clergyman, do not fully understand what the Innu are saying about this land of theirs. It is as though we are in India amid certain cows which have sacred rights. This land is sacred to these people. Their religion, their values and their way of life are closely tied to this land. We -- and I include church here -- have trampled over that fact to press our views upon these people.

This morning in the presentation by Major McCabe I picked out a couple of words that he said in answer to some of the questions. He said, "I understand the peoples' concern over land, but that is outside military's operation". In a second part, he said, "It is not a military affair". I really think he does not understand the Innu's appreciation and concern over the land.

In another point he referred to the people, "When they go to their camps in the country". People here would not say that. They would say they are going to their land, not to their camps.

There are two little backgrounders or concerns I want to raise. One was referred to by Cajetan earlier. That was the business of the Makkovik expierience. It seems to me that from that experience the Newfoundland Government was willing to

MacDonald, Sub.

allow a three year go-ahead to mine uranium and to use the slag to build a roadway and shipping of this material out. The whole notion in that for the government was a quick way of filling their coffers. There was little concern given to the damage to environment and, as Cajetan rightly pointed out, the development was stopped.

I was here 10 years ago when that was happening and there was a Moravian Minister and a couple of people from Makkovik went around to each community on the coast to raise that concern.

The other disappointing experience was last September 23rd, 1985 when Colonel David and the entourage of people from both levels of government came into the community to hold a meeting to make us aware of what was going on. The meeting began at 2:45 and it ended at 3:15. They had time to show their film, they had about two or three questions asked from some of the people and there was some sort of an emergency in Nain where they needed the helicopters. It seemed very strange to me that they would head off all to Nain rather than allow the helicopters and the search pilots to go rescue this boat and the rest to stay and hear what the people had to say. It seemed to me, the criticism I would make is that they simply wanted to touch down to say that they had been to most of the coastal communities and when they got back to say, look, we have gone to these people and we have

MacDonald, Sub.

found little or no resistance to our proposal. The true fact of the matter is that there is growing resistance, not just among Innu and Inuit but among many non-Innu as well.

There is only one question I have concerning the Guidelines and that will be the end of my little presentation.

The general review principle 2(c) states namely that:

> "All information submitted to the Panel by the proponent and other participants in the review will be available to the public."

This appears to be contradicted in 5(2)(a) that states that:

> "E.I.S. (the Environmental Impact Statement) will be more widely available."

Which is it? Are things going to be available to the public as a general principle of your hearings or is going to be until after the Environmental Statement is prepared, that then information would be more widely available?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot --

FR. MacDONALD: Follow the logic?

THE CHAIRMAN: -- determine the Section that you are speaking about. I am sure there is no real contradiction, if there appears to be one. Are we speaking of the Draft Guidelines dated August 1986?

FR. MacDONALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you give me a page reference, please?

FR. MacDONALD: It is General Principle 2(c). It is under the "General Review Principles".

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, that cannot be the Guidelines document. Would it be the terms of reference?

FR. MacDONALD: The terms of reference, that is what it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we can clarify that. The fact is that any and all documents presented to the Panel throughout the course of this review are available on request, available to anyone.

With regard to the Environmental Impact Statement, there will be the entire report and, besides that, there will be the summary section taken from that report and bound and published separately. We anticipate that there will be a greater demand for the summary section. In other words, more people will want to read just the summary than will be willing to read the entire report. So, for that reason, we plan to arrange that a great number of copies of the summary will be produced as compared with copies of the entire Environmental Impact Statement.

If we find that there is a much larger demand for the entire Environmental Impact Statement, then we anticipate at the present time that we can certain arrange to have more copies produced. I would say at the same time, though, that it is never anticipated in a review like this that a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement would be made available free of charge as a personal copy to everybody who might ask for it. We try to anticipate the demand for the entire Impact Statement from various interested groups and then copies are placed in libraries and other places of easy access but we do not anticipate that every resident of a community, for example, would need to have his own personal copy of the entire Impact Statement, which could be quite voluminous.

FR. MacDONALD: Thanks very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Father MacDonald.

May we hear from somebody else now, please?

MR. BERT SAUNDERS: My name is Bert Saunders. I am from Davis Inlet.

I guess this could be a question and answer for both the biologists and the Armed Forces. Firstly, to the Armed Forces, why is it that you need so much land to do the low level flying? You were talking about 135 more; is that 135 more just coming or is that what is already up there and there is still more coming? What will happen to the 1,700 people? Is this for the NATO base or is this what is going to happen for the training that is going to take place in Goose Bay?

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe, I wonder

if you could reply to that, please?

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, the reasons for so much area: That is just the area that happens to have been set out when they originally required an area. That can be changed. Possibly the results of this study may recommend that the area be changed or moved or made smaller. So, that is something that was done some time ago. There is no specific reason why that much.

The 136 aircraft I mentioned is the number -- the maximum number that is proposed for the NATO centre, if a full scale centre is built. It may be smaller than that, but that would be, say, a maximum number, as far as NATO tells us, and that would be over and above what we have. But those would not all be for low level flying.

The last thing, the 1,700 people, again, is a prediction for the NATO centre as a maximum number, an ideal number that would be required to support the size of operation that they are talking about.

MR. SAUNDERS: Why did you pick Labrador for the low level flying? I mean, will the flying be done in Labrador or will it be over cities and why did you pick northern Labrador where the hunting -- we call it the barrens, but it is really not barren; there is caribou, there is all kinds of wildlife in there. I was wondering, you have low level flying, but what is the low level flying for and why is it practiced in Goose Bay. Because, if there is going to be war, the bombs will be dropping on cities, not on Labrador. This is why I cannot understand why you should have low level flying in Labrador disturbing the wildlife when, really, the bombs are going to be dropping on big cities. The practice should be done over big cities or wherever the actual war will be because I doubt if there is going to be any war in the barrens of Labrador.

MAJOR McCABE: That is not really true to say that in time of war the only place they would be low flying or they would bomb would be big cities. Our targets would, I assume, be military targets. The low flying is required to be able to get to those targets without being detected by radar. The training is done in Labrador as it is done in several other places in Canada because they select areas which are least populated or where least disturbance is. The training done in Europe right now is done over areas which is much, much more densely populated than the areas we are using here.

MR. SAUNDERS: Now, for the biologists. There has been low level flying in Labrador now for about nine years. Have you guys done any experiments with the damage or anything that has been happening in that nine years since there has been low level flying in Labrador? Have there been any studies done on the environment that is damaging the caribou and the wildlife in Labrador?

MR. TOM NORTHCOTT: As I understand your question, there have been no caribou or other wildlife studies tied directly to low level flying except a caribou study which is going on right now.

MR. SAUNDERS: Do you not think there should have been studies done when the low level flying started. I am not a biologist or anything like that, but I think it is damaging the wild fowl and the animals and now they will be practicing on the ocean. I am sure that is going to have some effect on the fish and the seals that are in the ocean. There has been low level flying for nine years and you mean to tell me that biologists have not done anything about it yet, not even to find out if they are damaging the geese or cracking the eggs or even ruining the spawning grounds of fish. Nine years is quite a long time. Then, in two years time, you expect to get all these answers -- to get the answers in two years.

MR. NORTHCOTT: Yes, I agree with you, it would have been very good had they begun studies on the impact on wildlife when the low level flying first started. I think we perhaps all recognize that now. I think that the studies to attempt to determine the impact of low level flying on wildlife done over the next year or so will not provide all the answers, but we hope that they will continue beyond that and they will also be looking at studies elsewhere related to flying and low level flying.

MR. SAUNDERS: Finally, do you think

that even if the proposals do go in for this NATO base the federal government and the military will honour it or will they just throw it away and say, we are going to take it over anyhow?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that this Panel could respond to a question about what the military are likely to do. I am not sure Major McCabe would care to make any response to that question.

MAJOR McCABE: I think, as I mentioned this morning, we are part of a government. We take orders or directions and a good part from the government in peacetime. It is not a military decision, it is a government decision. I might use the example that was mentioned earlier about the uranium project near Makkovik. A study was done and we know what the results were and the government, I assume, made that decision. I think the example is right there. If the study shows major damage that is being caused or could be caused, then the onus is on the government to do something about that.

MR. SAUNDERS: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Well, we have heard some very interesting presentations but there are more people in the audience yet that we have not heard from. There is still some more time available.

Yes, sir, come forward.

MR. LOUIS BYRNE: My name is Louis Byrne. I am a teacher here in the village of Davis

Inlet and also married to one of the Native people from the village. I have been here a number of years, so I have a few ideas or a few inclinations of what some of the things the Native people are about. I have a few comments. I did not make any formal presentation, I was just listening this morning and this afternoon to some comments and some questions. Some of the questions are for Major McCabe and maybe just a few general comments about things that I have observed today.

The first two comments and questions are for you, Major McCabe, so maybe you can respond when I am finished or one at a time, maybe.

The first general comment was this morning you opened up with a comment that the Goose Bay Training Centre has been present since 1941, so that is approximately, what, 45 or 46 years. I suspect the reason you made that comment was just to give a bit of history of the training base in Goose Bay, but when you compare 45 or 46 years to a few thousand years of Native people being in Labrador, it is not much of a comparison in terms of land usage or the availability of land to groups of people. So, if we compare 45 or 46 years to a few thousand years, there is not much of a comparison in terms of land usage and it does not give much of an indication of or a background in terms of who owns or who has proper usage of the land. I think, in this case, the people who have been around a few thousand years should have a large say in what happens to a particular area or a particular piece of land they have been living on for such a long period of time. That is just a comment.

The next one is a question, Major. This morning you were talking about flight plans. When the pilots are making a particular flight plan for daily training or weekly training, when they go to their commanding officer or somebody, whoever is in charge of flight plans, and they discuss the animals that are in a particular area or the possibility of people in the country in a particular area, is, in fact, the flight plan changed if it happens to be a small herd or a large herd of caribou or maybe a few families in the country in a particular area where those people are planning to fly that day? Do they actually change the flight plan to accommodate the people being in the country or a certain group of animals being in the country on that particular day?

So, when they do flight plans and it is found that there are animals or people around that area, do they change the flight plan?

MAJOR McCABE: I was not sure whether you wanted me to reply after each one or do you have several?

MR. BYRNE: After each one, please.

MAJOR McCABE: Sure. These flight plans -- first of all, a route, a specific route is planned by the aircrew, usually over a couple of hours. This is done before each flight. They, then, go and file that route with the Military Co-ordination Centre. At the beginning of each day the operation centres for the squadrons are informed of the location of the known camps and also any large concentrations of animals. So, they plan around those. That is a normal training practice.

MR. BYRNE: So, in theory, this is the way it is supposed to happen, the actual planning?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes.

MR. BYRNE: It does not always occur that way because planes have buzzed over this village a few times around Nain and different areas where they are not supposed to be and they showed up on certain days when nobody was expecting them for free fly past or something. I certainly repeat, that if those guys get lost or there is something wrong with their navigational equipment --

MAJOR McCABE: I did not say that they cannot fly around the villages. They file flight plans where they want to fly. If they come outside of those areas, they have to comply with the air regulations that apply to all other pilots in this country. There is nothing says they cannot fly outside those areas, they just must maintain different altitude regulations. That is why you will see them outside there once in a while.

MR. BYRNE: So, they are allowed to go to a different altitude outside of those areas?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, definitely, as any

other aircraft is in this country.

MR. BYRNE: The discussion is not that we have seen them low but that is fine in terms of flight paths.

The second question, Major, is concerning garbage, and it refers to the dummy bombs that you use for practice shooting with the aircraft. All the dummy bombs that you dump on a certain target area in the country, who cleans up this garbage? Are they left there or do you have personnel that go in there and clean up this mess of dummy bombs?

MAJOR McCABE: In a short answer, yes, people do go in and clean out those areas. That is one of the reasons why they have a specific defined area, so that they can clean it up.

MR. BYRNE: The next concern is you mentioned this morning the possibility of future use of live bombs with certain target areas. Has there been any study of the ecology in terms of what long term effects this could have on the ecology of any one particular area where a target location is set up?

MAJOR McCABE: No studies have been done of any areas for Labrador because no areas have been proposed yet, but those would have to be examined. We have other areas in Canada that are used for live weapons which could serve as excellent study grounds on the effects of that kind of thing before they are established here.

MR. BYRNE: Just one last thing. You have some background information on the live bomb usage on certain parts of the ecology and the rest of Canada. Does that also mean you have that kind of information in terms of live bomb usage in the ocean? There was the implication that maybe live bombs used in ocean target practice also.

MAJOR McCABE: There was not an implication that live weapons would be used. They would actually probably be a practice weapon. We do have several such areas both off the coasts of Canada and the United States which have been used for many years, which again are certainly good areas to study the effects and that kind of thing has to take place before any such area is established.

MR. BYRNE: So, the use of live bombs is just a possibility right now, it is a definite yes that live bombs will be used in Labrador in terms of military usage?

MAJOR McCABE: That is correct. Over land it is a proposal only; over sea has not even been discussed with live weapons, really, but over land is a proposal only.

MR. BYRNE: Just one last point. In the event that live bombs did come into use in target centres in Labrador, I am just trying to imagine, would the Native peoples be consulted in terms of the areas that will be used as a live bomb target centre?

MAJOR McCABE: Definitely, yes.

MR. BYRNE: Thank you, Major, for answering for the military.

Just one question I have for the Panel. You were referring to the studies that have been done on, in particular, the caribou herds and that sort of thing in different parts of Canada. In those studies that have been done, I would assume, by the government, have the Native peoples been consulted in terms of what could be the possible reasons that caribou herds have changed their migration routes or why they have not showed up at the different areas for maybe 10 or 20 years?

The question is: Have the Native peoples in different parts of Canada been consulted or questioned as to why certain wildlife animals or birds are not available any more in certain parts of Canada? Has it just been studies from the government point of view or have there been also Native populations consulted or questioned or asked for information?

MR. NORTHCOTT: The study on caribou that I was referring to is a study in which they are using radio callers and tracking the movement or any changes in the movement patterns of caribou that have been overflown compared with caribou that have not been overflown. That is being done in part by the Provincial Wildlife Service. I know that they have discussed generally with Native peoples what they are doing. I really do not know how much detail they have

9A

solicited from Native peoples. I do not know if anybody else on the Panel is aware of that.

MR. TIM McNEILL: They have a Steering Committee set up and I know that the Labrador Inuit Association is part of that Steering Committee, where they more or less designed the management of the study area and that. I do not know if NMIA has had any input into that or if they were invited to.

MR. BYRNE: It would appear that the most logical thing to do when you are doing a study in any area or on any particular topic is to go to the people that spend the most time in that particular area or on that particular topic. In this case, I cannot see anybody who would be more qualified to know anything about caribou than the Native people from this area or from Nain or from almost any coastal community in Labrador. This seems logical, to go to those people and ask their opinion or their response or get information from the Native people as to why things are as they are.

MR. BYRNE: Just two more general comments and that is it. The first one has already been alluded to when Father Jim was talking earlier on. We have two factions here: We have the Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Newfoundland; we have the Native peoples concerned about this low level flying. Basically, we have two factions that do not understand each other and do not understand what the other person is all about.

Major McCabe made a comment this morning that he understands what the people are talking about. When we talk about land claims we are talking about land usage but he really does not understand. With all due respect to Major McCabe and due respect to you people on the Panel, you do not understand what the people are talking about when we are talking about the usage of land and the animal hunt or connection. By no means do I assume that I understand either because I am not a Native either, but when it comes to Native people talking about land usage and the animal/Native person connection, you do not understand and I do not understand. It is only the Native people that understand that faction.

When it comes to military or low level flying in terms of usage of land for that purpose, you cannot expect the Native people to understand your position either because they do not understand defence of the country or understand the global view of what the implications are to a country that has a weak defence system.

So, that is just a basic comment on the problems that you people are going to run into in terms of understanding your side and trying to understand the other side, the Native population.

The last comment is basically for you people and the Native people also and that is the element of compromise. I think any group of people that are living today and looking towards the future, you cannot live in the past for any length of time and expect to progress into the future. With regard to the Native people, you cannot have things as they have been in the past. Things have changed, the world population is getting a lot bigger, so you have to make room for everybody in the world no matter how much land you want. The same goes for the federal Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Labrador and Newfoundland. You have to compromise also. You cannot have all the land you want in terms of low level flying.

So, it is the element of compromise that has to be kept in line here. Cajetan made an allusion to it this morning in his presentation or early this afternoon. The Native people are not looking to make enemies of themselves with the government and I am sure the government is not looking to make themselves an enemy of the Native people. So, the element of compromise has to be in there somewhere and they also all have to look towards the future. So, when you are studying this thing and listening to Native people, I hope this element of compromise is kept in the back of your minds when you make a final presentation or a firal documentation of your study.

Those are all the questions and comments I was concerned about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, si for your thoughtful and very sensible comments. I can assure you that we as a Panel are going to try as hard as we can to understand the points of view of all the parties involved in this review. If we can do a little towards reducing the level of misunderstanding amongst the parties over the next year or so, I think we may have accomplished an important part of our task. We will keep what you have said in mind. Thank you very much.

I believe, unfortunately, that the time has come to conclude the meeting. I am not sure that the record of our performance here today is going to be very much better than that of the Department of National Defence one year ago. I think we have managed to stay a little longer than they have. I apologize, again, for the rushed nature of the visit. We are trying to visit as many communities as we can within a reasonable period of time. We hope in the time we have been here that we have heard a good representation of the opinions of the people who live here in Davis Inlet.

I believe I have already indicated that this is only the beginning of the review as far as the public is concerned. There will be other occasions when we will be planning visits to communities and I could certainly say for sure that if the people of Davis Inlet maintain their interest in this review and indicate to us that they want to continue speaking to this Panel then we will be sure to include Davis Inlet on our list of communities to be visited in the next round of meetings.

In closing, let me say thank you to all of you for coming and thank you especially to those of you who have come forward and spoken to us, asked us questions and made presentations. We have been made very welcome in the community, we have enjoyed our short visit and we would plan to come again.

Thank you to Mrs. Thomson, our reporter, and to Mr. Sicoli, our audio technician. A special thank you to Mr. Joe Rich, our interpreter, who has worked so hard today.

Thank you again and goodbye.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Volume

16

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	RIGOLET	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 30, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	16	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Rigolet Community Hall, Rigolet

DATE: October/octobre 30, 1986.

VOLUME: 16

INDEX

PAGE
Introduction by The Chairman 1768
Presentation by Major David McCabe 1788

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Bill Shiwak 1786
Kenny Michelin 1805
Bill Shiwak 1806
Kenny Michelin 1810
Bill Shiwak 1811
Kenny Michelin 1812
Bill Shiwak 1814
Max Blake 1819
Kenny Michelin 1820
Max Pottle 1823
Kenny Michelin 1824
Sharon Edmunds 1826
Kenny Michelin 1860
Bill Shiwak 1862
Kenny Michelin 1866
Bill Shiwak 1867

* * * * *

---Upon commencing at 7 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment of the Government of Canada to conduct a public environmental review of a proposal for continuing and new military flying activities based in Goose Bay and involving flying over certain parts of Labrador and the Province of Quebec.

In a few moments, I will explain how this process is supposed to work but, first, I would like to introduce you to the other members of the Panel.

Beginning at the end of the table to your left, we have, first, Mr. Don Stewart.

Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions and he was at one time stationed at Goose Bay.

Mr. Stewart lives near Ottawa and since his retirement, he has operated a small farm.

Next to Mr. Stewart is Mr. Tom Northcott.

Mr. Northcott is a biologist who lives in St. John's. He has had extensive experience with wildlife, generally, and with caribou, in particular, in Newfoundland and Labrador, formerly as an employee of the Wildlife Division of the Government of

Newfoundland and Labrador, more recently as the vice-president of a firm called Northland Associates Limited, which is a consulting firm in environmental and renewable resource questions.

The next gentlemen, I am sure, needs little introduction to most of you. He is, of course, Mr. Tim McNeill.

Mr. McNeill lives in Makkovik where he operates a small business. He brings to our Panel considerable knowledge of the concerns and interests of the Inuit people of Labrador.

To my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec, where he has been very active in Montagnais Indian Band affairs and in certain commercial interests in that community.

Prior to his retirement, Mr. Jourdain was employed by the Iron Ore Company of Canada for approximately 25 years.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson.

Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who works extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of northern Quebec. He is currently a resident of Montreal where he operates a consulting firm.

He was involved in the negotiation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis and is still involved in the implementation of that Agreement.

I am employed with the Federal

Environmental Assessment Review Office of the federal government in Ottawa where, when I am not acting as the Chairman of this Panel, I am the Director for the Atlantic Region for that office.

I have been in that position for approximately one year, prior to which I lived in St. John's and was employed with the Environment Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

This Panel is in Rigolet today because we are conducting a series of meetings in approximately 17 communities in Labrador and Quebec, to meet the people in those communities, to talk to them about this proposed military project and, as I will explain in a minute, to hear comments, if you have any, on a certain draft document which the Panel published in August of this year.

To go back and give you a bit of the background of this process, in 1973, the Government of Canada decided that it wished to improve the process of planning for certain resource development projects which happened to be the responsibility of the Government of Canada in some way, such as being federally-initiated or being proposed for federal land or being proposed to be supported by federal funding, for example.

As part of that planning process, the government wanted to ensure that the amount of public consultation and public involvement in the process leading up to a government decision on a project was improved over what it had been prior to that.

So, at that time, the government established a procedure known as the Environmental Assessment Review process.

Under that process, any department of the federal government which has a proposal for some sort of resource development project has to examine that project first internally within its own department to determine whether or not that project may have significant side effects on the environment or whether it may cause considerable concern in the minds of the public.

If the department decides that there may be significant environmental effects or that there will be public concern, it is the responsibility of that department to refer the project to the Minister of the Environment, asking the Minister to arrange for a public environmental review to be conducted and completed before any decision on that project is taken.

So it was, then, that in February of this year the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of the Environment, putting forward the proposal of which you are probably aware are this time and which will be explained to all of us in a few minutes, and asked the Minister of the Environment to appoint an Environmental Assessment Panel to conduct this public environmental review.

The Panel was appointed by the Minister in July of this year and, at that time, the Minister gave to the Panel its mandate, contained in a document which we call the Terms of Reference for the Panel. That document was made public at the time and is still available to anyone who would like to have a copy of it.

The way in which a Panel like this conducts its review is to ask the proponent department -- in this case, the Department of National Defence -- to prepare and submit a report called an Environmental Impact Statement, which describes the project, which, from the point of view of the proponent, predicts the environmental effects. That means not only the effects on the natural environment, such as the water and the animals, et cetera, but also on the human environment, the customs, the cultural background, the social customs of the people, their economic conditions and, at the same time, proposes ways of dealing with those expected impacts coming from the project, whether it might be to try to enhance any beneficial impacts or to minimize any undesirable impacts.

That Environmental Impact Statement is usually a fairly substantial document, perhaps of one or two volumes, and is usually supported by a great deal of background information, such as reports on studies which may have to be carried out before the document is written.

The Environmental Impact Statement is really one of the central documents, one of the most important documents, of the public review.

The Panel examines the impact statement when it has been submitted, examines a great deal of background information from other sources and, also, goes out and meets with the public, talks with the public, listens to what they have to say and, at the end, takes all of this information and writes a report of its own to the government.

In order to make sure that the Environmental Impact Statement to be written by the proponent covers all of the proper subjects and addresses all of the important issues, the Panel must give to the proponent a set of instructions.

Those instructions are contained in a document called the Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Now, as I mentioned a few moments ago, the Panel published a draft of that Guidelines document in August of this year. The draft was distributed to everyone on the mailing list which we have been keeping at the Federal Assessment Review Office and we are presently conducting this series of meetings to hear what any interested people have to say about that document, to tell us whether they think it is adequate, whether it needs to be improved in some way, and when these meetings are over -- and they will end at the end of this week -- the Panel will meet in November to consider all of the information that has come forward in these meetings and to set about improving that Guidelines document to make it the best that it can possibly be.

Our intention is to be able to present the final form of that Guidelines document to the Department of National Defence some time in December of this year.

That document, of course, will also be made public.

National Defence will then begin the process of researching, compiling a great deal of information and using the Guidelines as their instructions, will begin to write its Environmental Impact Statement.

According to the tentative schedule that we have in mind now, we expect that that Environmental Impact Statement may be ready to be submitted from National Defence to the Panel some time in 1987, perhaps in the early summer.

As soon as the Panel receives the Impact Statement, it will be made public, just as every document presented to the Panel is made public.

Over the following period of perhaps two or three months, the Impact Statement will be reviewed, not only by the Panel, of course, but by various departments of provincial and federal governments who are involved in this exercise and, also, by the public.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that it has met the requirements put forward in the Guidelines document, the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings which, in many ways, will be similar to this meeting that we are holding here tonight.

At the hearings, the project and the Environmental Impact Statement will be discussed, the Panel will again listen to what the public has to say and, after the hearings are over, the Panel will proceed to write its own report to government, drawing its own conclusions about the proposed project and its expected environmental effects and its conclusions about the commitments that National Defence will make in that Impact Statement to deal with the expected environmental impacts.

We expect that the Panel might be ready to submit that report to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence some time late in 1987 or early 1988.

Now, in a few minutes, as I have said, we will hear a description of the proposed project itself and also hear something about the time schedule associated with that project.

So, if you keep in mind what I have just told you about the timetable of the review, you will see how it fits into the timetable for approval of the military activities.

I would like to say a few words about the Guidelines document itself.

I understand that, for one reason or

another, only a very few people in this community of Rigolet may have had an opportunity to see the Guidelines document.

We apologize for that. There seems to have been some lapse in communications between the office and your community which we will certainly proceed to correct as fast as we can but I do not believe that any great harm is done by that. I think we can make up for that by listening very carefully to what you may have to say to us tonight.

Certainly, in other places where we have already been, a similar situation has existed, maybe not for the same reasons, but we have heard in other places, not only specific comments on the Draft Guidelines document, we have also heard a lot of other things about how the people feel about the project, what concerns they may have in their mind about the project.

Those comments can be just as useful to us as a Panel in deciding whether we have done a good job on this Guidelines document already or whether it needs to be improved in one way or another.

So, please, do not let the fact that you may not have seen the Draft Guidelines document stop you from coming forward tonight and speaking to us about how you feel about the proposal.

There is nothing terribly mysterious about the Guidelines document. It really sets out to the proponent, the Department of National Defence, the way in which this Panel believes they should go about preparing and writing the Environmental Impact Statement.

At the beginning, there are some definitions which I will not go into at the moment and after a few introductory pages, the Guidelines state what is to be the scope of the review.

The opening paragraph, for example, makes it clear that these Guidelines apply to the entire project, including all activities that may be associated with its construction, with its operation and maintenance, and, up to and including the possible termination and demobilization of the project, the closedown.

In accordance with the way in which the project has been described to us by National Defence, the Panel has decided to divide the project into two parts, and, as far as possible, those two parts will be dealt with separately in the Environmental Impact Statement.

At the same time, we recognize that these two parts of the project may overlap somewhat in terms of the effects they may have on the environment and the proponent will be expected to deal with that as best it can.

The two parts of the project are, first of all, the low level training that has been carried out now for several years in accordance with agreements between Canada and certain of its NATO allies. I am sure you are all familiar with that activity; you will have either witnessed parts of it yourself or you will have heard about it on the news.

Tied in with that existing activity is a proposal for it to be expanded somewhat in the coming years, perhaps by either the countries now involved increasing the amount of their activity or by one or more other NATO allies becoming involved.

So that, all together, makes up the first part of the proposed project.

The other part of it is the proposal to establish at Goose Bay a facility called the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre for NATO and the purpose of that will be described to you in a few minutes.

The next section of the Guidelines deals with the methods to be used by National Defence in acquiring the information that it will need to write the Impact Statement and the methods to be used in analyzing that information and compiling it and presenting it in the Impact Statement.

The Panel makes it clear in these Guidelines that National Defence is to regard the entire system in which we live as a system of inter-relating component parts, called an ecosystem or ecological system, including the human populations, their social and cultural structures, as part of a total life-support system involving the air, the water, minerals, soil, the plants, animals, micro-organisms, all of which function together and inter-relate to form a working system.

This is an approach which has been adopted in other studies of this sort because it is found to be really the best, logical way of approaching it, rather than trying to treat different parts. of the environment separately.

The next section of the Guidelines sets out the issues to be addressed in the review and up to August, when the Panel published this document, the Panel had identified nine issues which, at that time, were believed to be important in conducting this review.

The Panel points out that these may not be the only issues, that information presented to us in the course of these meetings may lead us to alter this somehow, perhaps to expand the list to include more issues.

At the present time, then, the Draft contains the following nine issues:

Number one, the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and, also, on wildlife.

Number two, the effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use.

Number three, the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities within the project area.

Number four, the impacts of the project

on commercial activities based on renewable resources, an example of that being, perhaps, outfitters.

Number five issue, the impacts of construction activities associated with the expansion of Goose Bay Airport on the natural environment and the impacts of exhaust emissions from increased flying activities, again on the natural environment.

Issue number six, the cumulative effects of the project and possibly of other projects and activities which may be carried out in the region, either at the present time or in the future.

Issue number seven, the need for monitoring of the project, if it is carried out, monitoring of the construction phase, monitoring of operational phases and even monitoring of the shutdown and termination.

Issue number eight, the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges.

Number nine, the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims.

A word of explanation on this, the Panel has been directed in its Terms of Reference not to deal with the subject of the policy of the Government of Canada which it uses in its negotiations with Native people on land claims. So the policy is not up for discussion.

However, accepting that policy for what it is, the Panel feels that it is still important to examine the effects which the project may have on the outcome of those negotiations which are either going on at the present time or are about to begin.

The final section of the Guidelines lays out what may be regarded as a Table of Contents for the Environmental Impact Statement, in that it states the suggested order of presentation of the material in the Environmental Impact Statement and the manner in which it should be presented.

First of all, the beginning section of the Impact Statement would be a summary of the whole document. Besides being presented as the first part of the entire document, the summary would also be published and bound separately because we believe that some people may either not want to or not need to read the entire document which is expected to be quite large.

So we are expecting to be presented with a summary which consolidates the important findings of the Impact Statement and must be written in such a manner as to allow readers to focus immediately on the major projected impacts of the project, on the principal areas of uncertainty, that is, information gaps, perhaps, and other important matters.

Another essential part of the Impact Statement would deal with the justification and need for the project.

The Panel is convinced that both the

public and the Panel need a better understanding of the justification and the rationale for the project to use as a background to the examination of the issues.

There must be a discussion of other projects which may, in some way, inter-relate with the project under review to produce combined impacts.

So the proponent will be expected to present information on other existing, planned or probable developments within any of the areas that may be affected by the project, such developments, for example, as the north warning radar system, the commercial caribou hunts near Nain and Kuujjuaq in Quebec, possible hydro-electric projects at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls and the Trans-Labrador Highway.

The proponent will also have to discuss alternatives, that is, the major alternatives to the project, including those that it may have already rejected.

These might include, for example, alternative sites for runways and infrastructure, alternate flying areas to the ones that are being proposed.

Another example might be the use of flight simulators as a flight training aid, combined with actual low level flying.

Another essential part of the Impact Statement would be a description of the project itself, of course.

There is a project description at the present time which formed part of this referral document which was presented to the Minister of Environment in February of this year, which I have already mentioned.

The Panel has examined that document and has identified additional information that is needed immediately or almost immediately in order to fully understand the project.

The Panel has written to National Defence, asking to have this information supplied. Some of it is already being supplied in the course of these meetings; other information, we understand, will be supplied in writing in the not too distant future.

Having described the project itself and the alternatives and the associated projects, the proponent will be expected to go on to discuss the existing environment and here, we will not be asking for a total description of every possible component of the environment, simply because there may be certain parts of the environment that will not, in any way, be affected by this project.

Instead of that, we ask that the environment be described with the issues in mind, issues which I have already read to you, together, perhaps, with other issues that may be added in the course of the next few weeks.

This description of the environment

will serve as a base line description, against which the impacts of the project can be identified and evaluated.

We will then have a description of the environment, a description of the project and, then, placing the project into that environment, the next section of the Impact Statement which will predict the environmental and the socio-economic impacts which might be expected.

In particular, this section must include an analysis of the impacts of the closedown of the project, in addition to the impacts of its construction and operation.

I mentioned earlier that the proponent will be expected to propose measures to deal with these impacts, some of which may be beneficial, some of which may be harmful.

These measures, which we call mitigative measures, must propose ways of enhancing or prolonging beneficial impacts, as well as measures to eliminate or to reduce adverse effects and in discussing these measures, the proponent must also identify very clearly who will be responsible for individual mitigative measures or damages, including those which may be caused by personnel or equipment belonging to a non-Canadian organization, for obvious reasons, because of the nature of the project.

Once measures have been put forward to deal with impacts, the proponent will have to look at how successful those measures are expected to be and whether there may be residual impacts, leftover impacts, that is, for which mitigative measures cannot be devised or which may remain even after the successful application of mitigating measures.

The next section of the Impact Statement would deal with the monitoring that I mentioned earlier.

The purpose of that monitoring would be threefold:

First of all, to test the validity and the accuracy of the impacts which had been predicted in the Impact Statement;

Secondly, to identify and evaluate any impacts which might turn up which were not predicted; and

Thirdly, monitoring designed to test the effectiveness of the mitigating measures.

The proposal for this monitoring program which one might expect would continue during construction phases, during operational phases, would describe and provide cost estimates and would identify the responsibility for carrying out that monitoring, some of which might have to be carried out, for example, by the proponent himself and some of which might have to be carried out by various departments of the government.

That, then, is a brief outline of the Guidelines document.

Now, before we go on to hear something about the project itself, perhaps there are some questions, perhaps there is something that I have said that is not quite clear. If so, we would be glad to try to clear up any uncertainty now, either about the review process that we are going through or about the Guidelines document.

Would anybody like to ask a question?

MR. BILL SHIWAK: Do I have to go to a microphone to do it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. There is a microphone standing in the middle of the floor or you could sit at the table over at the side, whichever you like. Would each speaker be kind enough to give his name? You do not have to do anything, sir. The technician will turn it on for you. It is on when the red light is on.

MR. SHIWAK: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I have your name, please.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, first of all, I thought you came here to listen to us. The meeting starts at 7 and is going to end at 10. So far, we have been listening to you all night.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, sir, if I may say something, we do not have to end at ten o'clock, first of all.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, I do not plan to stay here all night, you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we thought that it was important for you to understand something about this process and the project because, apparently, most people here had not had an opportunity to see much of the information that had been sent out.

So, I apologize for taking the time, but I really do think that it is worthwhile doing that. We do not have to end at ten o'clock. So, please, proceed to ask your question.

MR. SHIWAK: I do not know the Armed Forces. What is his rank?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Major?

MR. SHIWAK: The Major is going to make a speech, too?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. SHIWAK: Before we get into the real question period?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right but, in the meantime, if you have a question about anything that I have just said, you are welcome to ask it now.

MR. SHIWAK: About the Guidelines, you mean?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, or the process.

MR. SHIWAK: As far as I can see, we are trying to get into asking technical questions here, sort of like a brainwashing thing. I do not intend to get into that. I do not know the technical side of it at all.

But, anyway, unless somebody else has

a question, I would like to hear what the Major has to say first, so that we can get into the real issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, sir. That is fine. If that is what you wish, we will have the Major come forward.

As part of our common practice in meetings of this sort, we always invite along a representative of the proponent to describe the project and to answer any questions about the nature of the project.

So I will now introduce to you Major David McCabe of the Department of National Defence who will present a brief description of the project and will then answer any of your questions about it.

Major?

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman, Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of Rigolet:

I certainly understand the gentleman's concern about having a chance to talk. I wanted to support what the Chairman says here because what I want to talk about now is to give you information about the things that we are proposing for Goose Bay. If we do not get an opportunity to talk to you about these things, then you are left in the dark and it is very important that you do understand, so please bear with me.

Just a little bit about myself, I am from Ottawa, from the National Defence Headquarters. I have, for the past two years, been the project officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, as it is called, and I also work on all military plans concerning Goose Bay.

I, in fact, spent a little time in Goose Bay myself as an air-traffic controller, my first tour in the military, spent two years there, and I have been, more recently, in the flying business as a fighter pilot. So I know a little bit about the area and also a bit about the flying side of things.

I am not going to get into a lot of history about Goose Bay. I am sure you people are quite familiar with it. I will just say that it has been connected with the military ever since it was built in 1941 at which time, of course, the airport was established as a staging base, a refuelling stop for aircraft that were on their way to Europe in support of the Second World War.

During the peak years, probably about the mid-60s, Goose Bay had a military population with families of nearly 12,000 people. As we all know, the numbers have diminished considerably since that time.

At that time, the United States Air Force had air defence squadrons, air interceptor fighters at Goose Bay and also had the large air re-fuelling tanker aircraft which supported the strategic air command bombers that used to fly across to Europe.

The Royal Air Force, for many years, in fact, since the late 50s, flew the large Delta-wing Vulcan bomber, primarily doing low level navigation routes up through the Labrador interior.

Those have been replaced today by the smaller Tornado fighter bomber.

Since 1980 there has been a noticeable increase in military flying at Goose Bay, particularly with respect to low level flying.

At that time, there was an initial interest shown by the German Air Force in starting similar flying that the British were doing.

As a result of that, the Department of National Defence conducted a desk study of the proposed flying operations and, also, there was a requirement at the time for what we call a practice weapons range.

Now, that desk study was not meant to be an in-depth, on-site study by specialists. It was done in Ottawa by examining existing material and existing studies that pertained to the kind of activities that were looking at at that time. That report was called an initial environmental evaluation.

The evaluation concluded that any detrimental effects to the environment would really be negligible, in the opinion of the Department. One thing that there was some concern about because there was not much existing data was the effect or potential effect of the jets on caribou. So at that time, they made a recommendation to avoid the animals, particularly large concentrations of them, as much as possible and, also, at sensitive times of the year.

Because of the increase of flying that took place, then, it was necessary to co-ordinate and control all the local military flying in a safe and efficient manner.

That resulted in 1984 in the establishment of the military co-ordination centre. That centre is manned by Canadian Forces personnel and their primary responsibility is to take all flight plans from all the military aircraft that are flying locally and, on a daily basis, they advise the pilots of the location of any restrictions, local restrictions, in the training area, such as concentrations of caribou that might be going through in migration or during the calving period, as well, the location of any known, occupied fishing and hunting camps in the interior.

Now, when the location is given to the pilots, they mark a circle on their map, about five miles in diameter, and that is an area to be avoided because there are people living there at that particular time.

Currently, there are four military users, as we call them, in Goose Bay, four countries that are involved, all of which are signatories to a ten-year, multi-national Memorandum of Understanding, as it is called, which was signed in February of this year.

This Agreement covers all military flying activity at Goose Bay over the next ten years.

The United States Air Force today has a small detachment of personnel, about 16 people, whose primary job is to service the transient, transport aircraft, the great, big aircraft that carry supplies back and forth to Europe.

The Canadian Forces, one of the four countries being Canada, operate the long-range radar, known as the Melville Radar, the air-traffic control radar facilities and they also provide transient servicing to Canadian military aircraft that are flying back and forth to Europe and, as of March of this year, the Canadian Forces operate three rescue helicopters at Goose Bay.

In years past, the helicopters were only there during the summer flying season. Now, the station rescue flight is there on a permanent basis, year-round.

In 1988, the Canadian Forces will establish what is called a deployed operating base, consisting of four CF-18 fighters, actually, out of Baggotville. These fighters will be stationed in Goose Bay on alert, fulfilling air defence roles, similar to the old Voodoo that used to come in once in a while.

The Royal Air Force, as I mentioned, is continuing to carry out low flying training with the Tornado bomber. This year, for the first time, they kept aircraft in Goose Bay for the whole season, rather than taking them back and forth. They had nine aircraft there.

The German Air Force conducts similar training in the low level regime. They use a mixture of aircraft, Phantoms, Alpha jets and also Tornados and they usually have up to about 20 aircraft there at any one time.

The flying season, as you probably know, runs from about March until the beginning to the middle of October. It is completed for the year now.

As well as practicing the low level navigating and tactical maneuvering that I mentioned, these aircraft occasionally use a practice target range located about 65 miles south of Goose Bay. I have that marked on a map behind me here, as well as the low level training areas that these aircraft use.

This practice weapons range or practdice target range is in an open, sandy area that has been previously burned out in a forest fire. So it is quite a barren area. It is about eight miles in diameter or 13 kilometres and it is clearly marked all the way around it with signs printed in four languages.

Only non-explosive, non-contaminant devices are used on this range and there is no intention to use live weapons on this range. It is for practice weapons only.

Another site is required for the northern training area and they have been examining some areas in conjunction with the provincial wildlife and forestry people and other interested groups but, to date, no suitable area has been identified. So we only have one right now.

As the Chairman mentioned during his remarks, the current users have indicated a desire to expand their operations over the next few years.

As well, Canada, as you may have heard, is negotiating with the Government of the Netherlands towards establishing a long-term training program similar to that which exists with Germany and Britain.

The Royal Netherlands Air Force hopes to conduct a half-season training program in 1987, probably starting in June or July, using 10 to 12 F-16 fighters.

As some of you may know, the Dutch and the Belgian Air Forces had a few of these fighters in Goose Bay for about two weeks this summer for a trial period.

As well as these aircraft, there would be about 120 personnel coming through every couple of weeks to fly with the aircraft and to support them.

The expanded program will continue to be oriented primarily towards the low flying that is currently conducted.

As well, there might be an increase in some night flying and also flying in bad weather.

These last two activities are oriented towards the Tornado air crews, to practice using some equipment on board called the terrain-following radar which enables them to fly a certain level above the ground in an automatic mode, hands-off, and it takes quite a bit of training for that.

The other proposal which the Department of National Defence is pursuing for Goose Bay that you have probably heard a lot about is called the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. That is just a fancy, long name for an advanced training school, if you like, for air crews that fly fighter-type aircraft.

This project, at the time, is a proposal only, as opposed to the other operation which is ongoing.

It has, however, caught the public attention a great deal because of its potential size and the scope of activity that is proposed for the centre.

Before I give details of the centre itself and the kind of activity, I want to just give a little background of why this NATO centre is being considered.

Much of the tactical flying training, as we call it, by the military aircraft in NATO is conducted over the densely populated countries of western Europe with a concentration of activity over West Germany.

Each year about 538,000 military flights are conducted over Germany which has a population of 63 million people. One hundred and ten thousand of those flights are in the low level regime. These are day and night.

Existing training areas in Europe are extremely limited in size and capacity, the number of aircraft they can handle. Indeed, some types of training that are required nowadays are very difficult for some countries to achieve due to a lack of suitable facilities there.

Recognizing the need to overcome national training shortfalls and to maintain the deterrent effect of a well-trained air force, NATO, in 1980, decided to study the feasibility of establishing an integrated tactical fighter weapons training centre which could handle all the kinds of training that they needed and that they had problems achieving.

Nations were asked at the time to submit their training requirements, their annual training requirements and, based on these statistics, a NATO working group defined the scope of an ideal facility, an optimum facility, that could handle all of the training requirements of all of the countries.

At the time, the working group was instructed that cost was not to be a constraint in coming up with the design of this centre.

As a result, a huge full-scope facility was proposed.

The scope of this training centre was detailed in a Phase I report, as it was called, which was submitted to NATO in June of 1983. Two countries have since offered sites for the location of this centre. Canada has offered Goose Bay and, as you have probably heard, Turkey is the other contender, with the Konya Air Base being the preferred site.

Site surveys were conducted of these two locations last year and reports were written up and an initial recommendation has been submitted to NATO by this working group.

NATO is expected to decide on the selection of the most suitable site in their opinion by December of this year.

Now, following that decision, the negotiations will commence with the selected country and, also, detailed planning and design of the actual facility will start. That will go on over the next two years, hopefully finishing by December of 1988.

So a lot of work has to be done on the actual design of the facility, because, right now, it is just a general idea.

If, during that two-year phase, a major obstacle is encountered by the planning team or the negotiating team which cannot be overcome, then it has been recommended that the alternate site that was not selected will then be considered.

So, for example, if Turkey should be selected in December of this year, that does not mean that it is all over for Goose Bay, because, if they come into some kind of a problem there maybe a year down the road from now or whatever, then they might have to turn around and look at Goose Bay again because both sites have been recommended as being suitable for the location of it.

The NATO fighter weapons training centre, again in its optimum full scale -- it has been set down on paper -- would see up to 136 fighter-type aircraft, similar to the sort used there now, conducting up to 200 flights a day for 20 two-week detachments a year or, in other words, about 40 weeks of the year.

Each of these two-week detachments would require up to 45 sorties or flights by transport aircraft every two weeks, bringing in equipment and personnel to change over.

Each detachment would see a maximum of 370 air crew and 1300 ground personnel transiting through Goose Bay for training every two weeks. These personnel would be supported at the airfield by a multi-national base staff of about 1700 people.

As these support personnel would be in Goose Bay on two or three year postings, many of them could be expected to bring their families along with them, further increasing the population by 1000 or 1500 people.

Facilities, such as aircraft hangars, maintenance shops, operations centres, barracks, married quarters, recreational facilities and stores for normal consumer products would be required for this centre.

Included in the initial construction would be upgrading of the existing airfield facilities, including such things as a parallel runway and rehabilitation of the existing fuel storage and distribution system.

A regular re-supply system would have to be established, possibly necessitating the extension of the current shipping season in Lake Melville, or possibly, an expansion of the Trans-Labrador Highway system which, as we know, is under construction at this time.

As far as the types of training that might be carried out at the NATO centre, I want to emphasize again that, to date, there exists only an ideal model, a hypothetical model of this thing. As the initial training requirements that were drawn up were based on 1981 estimates, some adjustments may transpire during the detailed design and planning phase that I mentioned over the next two years.

Suffice it to say that, as currently proposed, aircraft would partake in several kinds of training activities, depending on their dedicated roles.

These might be low level tactical

navigation and reconnaissance similar to that done right now, air combat training, as we call it, at medium to high altitudes, which would include supersonic flight, electronic warfare training which uses electronic equipment both on the aircraft and also on the ground.

Practice weapons ranges would be required similar to the one that I spoke about earlier.

Live weapons ranges, they are looking for, ideally, three ranges which would be a similar size to a practice range.

Tactical air support of maritime operations, which is a fancy word for anti-shipping training, I will talk a little bit more about that in a second.

The last thing that they are looking for is what we call flag-type exercises and all that is, it involves large numbers of aircraft, different types of aircraft, flying in support of each other, towards a common goal.

Several of these training requirements that I mentioned are desirable only. They are optional things that they would like to have, recognizing limiting factors which might prevent these activities being carried out.

One of these is a sea range which is involved with the anti-shipping role that I mentioned.

The sea range -- and I believe there

has been some mention of it lately -- a sea range is merely an area where tactical maneuvers or flying maneuvers are conducted against military shipping.

From time to time, there may be some practice weapons, rockets or guns, that are fired at a target towed by one of these ships.

Now, this is not something new -- new for this area it would be, yes -- but several of these ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another example of one of these optional things is an air-to-air gunnery range. As the area beneath such a range must usually be sterile, as we call it, or unpopulated, it would probably have to be established over the ocean, if it is established at all.

Since the initial requirement for live weapons ranges that I mentioned, technology has advanced to the stage nowadays that there is a capability with a computerized system to conduct weapons training missions against realistic targets on the ground where you receive accurate scoring without any kind of weapon coming off the aircraft at all. It is all done with simulation.

This system is called a no-drop bomb scoring system and it has several obvious advantages, such as protection of the environment, because nothing hits the ground and, also has significant cost savings by not having a lot of weapons being used.

Such a system as I have just described there would very likely be part of the NATO training centre.

Should a live weapons area still be required, very stringent criteria would govern the selection of a suitable site. These ranges are closely monitored and are cleaned up on a regular basis. We have them in existence in several other parts of Canada.

Turning now, briefly, to socio-economic benefits which could accrue from such a project, employment opportunities, obviously, are directly proportional to the size of the facility that is built.

The Department of National Defence is just completing a socio-economic study which is based on the expanded, current operation that I described and also is examining the potential NATO facility.

With respect to the latter, the NATO facility, only the full scope as has been proposed was examined for this study and what they did, or what they are doing on this is basically coming up with an idea of the numbers of jobs, types of jobs on a national, provincial and local level and also revenues that might come into this and it is based on a national model, nationally-accepted model, it is not just a military thing.

Because of the fact they are looking at the overall size of the centre, particularly that was proposed, the resulting data are highly speculative, as any downsizing or reducing of the size of the centre would obviously proportionately affect the employment opportunity and the socio-economic results.

Employment opportunities would fall into two phases: the initial construction phase where they build up all those things that I mentioned would be required; and, from then, the regular operational phase, the day-to-day operations.

During its site survey last year, the NATO working group, while it was in Goose Bay, examined the possibility of establishing alternate airfields at Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville. These alternate airfields are used in case of aircraft emergency or for weather diversion; if the weather were to get bad at Goose Bay while the aircraft were out on the range, then they could recover at these other airfields.

As well, they might be used, depending on the training requirements, to launch a small number of aircraft to act in an opposition or an adversary role.

Such utilization of these facilities would require some upgrading of the runway facilities, re-fuelling systems and possibly some accommodation construction would have to be provided.

The working group is focusing their attention for the location of this NATO centre on the existing northern training area which I have depicted on the map.

The southern area, as it exists, would continue to be used primarily for the low flying training that is going on right now.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the expansion proposals that I have been talking about and which you hear about in the news are based on the assumption that a full-size training centre would be established at Goose Bay.

However, as we all know, all nations today are undergoing economic cutbacks, belt-tightening exercises, if you like, and military programs such as I have been talking about, are not exempt from these cutbacks.

As the actual planning and design details are worked out and subsequent funding sources are identified, then a clearer picture will emerge of what possibly lies ahead in the future for military activity for Goose Bay, in Labrador and Quebec, as well.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, for having the patience to bear with me here. I am certainly happy to take any questions about my presentation, about the two proposals or anything else that might come to mind. I would be more than happy to try and answer them for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. There are three people who have already indicated to us that they would like to speak to the Panel tonight. Two are residents of this community. One is a representative of the Labrador Inuit Association.

Before we hear from those speakers, I would like to ask if there are any questions about the project which the Major has just described.

Yes, sir? Would you kindly use the microphone and, for the record, in order that we may identify our speakers correctly on our transcript of the meeting, would you please give your name before you start.

MR. KENNY MICHELIN: My name is Kenny Michelin.

What I would like to know is, you said Goose Bay and Turkey are in the running for that NATO base and, if Goose Bay does happen to lose to Turkey, does that mean that Goose Bay is still open for any market for military service or any other aircraft or anything?

MAJOR McCABE: That is a good question and I am glad you asked it because, yes, indeed, it is.

First of all, as I mentioned, even if Turkey is recommended or selected in December, that two-year period of negotiations and planning may well end up with a problem being encountered with setting up in Turkey at which point they would turn around and say: This is not going to work. Let us go back and consider Goose Bay.

So that option is still there and it will stay in existence until such time as they start pouring concrete in Turkey.

So that option stays there.

The other option we have talked about, the expansion of the current operation, is going to happen, anyway. Obviously, it will be affected by recommendations and information that comes out of this study but it already is in existence, we already have people expanding buildings and everything else there. So it is happening.

If the centre goes to Turkey, we have already had assurances from the countries that are using this place that they will continue to use it.

MR. MICHELIN: Yes. As I said, if we do lose it to Turkey, would ours open for other countries to flying in Labrador?

MAJOR McCABE: Well, I can assure you, as I say, that we have had confirmation from these countries that they will continue to work here. Even though they would probably do some training there, there is training they can do in Labrador or Goose Bay that they cannot do in Turkey and they need to do it. So they would continue to come here, no doubt about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone else have a question about this?

MR. BILL SHIWAK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, please go

ahead.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes, sir. Do I give my name?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SHIWAK: Bill Shiwak.

Most of the things are going to happen whether this becomes a NATO base or not, whether Goose Bay becomes a NATO base or not, right? And it could escalate. I mean, the personnel could go way up, right?

MAJOR McCABE: I do not think the thing would necessarily go away up if the NATO thing does not come here.

I think what we would see is a modest expansion.

Right now, each country that is a signatory to that agreement I mentioned is allowed at present to have 400 people here and up to 25 aircraft.

Now, the more countries that become part of that agreement, then you are going to see up to that kind of increase for each of those countries. They would not necessarily start off with that but there would be a build-up.

So, over a period of time, obviously the more countries involved, then, yes, you would get a build-up but not nearly to the extent of the NATO centre.

MR. SHIWAK: So, besides the four

countries that are already involved, there could be other countries.

MAJOR McCABE: That is correct, yes. That is something we are continuing to promote.

As I mentioned, the Netherlands or Holland is already investing money in establishing facilities at Goose Bay and we have had expressions of interest from some other countries as well but that is on a very preliminary or early basis.

MR. SHIWAK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major, could I just ask a question, please?

Would it be fair to say, then, on the other hand, that there are certain aspects of the proposed Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre that would never be established as an expansion of the ongoing activity now?

If the training centre were to be established in Turkey, then certain things would never happen in Goose Bay as a result of an expansion of the current activities?

MAJOR McCABE: That is correct, sir. The orientation of the activity that would still carry on would be mostly towards the low level work. Possibly, as I say, a little bit of an increase in practice weapons ranges, et cetera, but a lot of the activities that I have described with the NATO centre involve very expensive, very sophisticated electronic systems, simulation systems and that, and you really would only set those up in one place.

MR. SHIWAK: May I ask another question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. Would you like to ask another question?

MR. MICHELIN: As soon as...

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, very good.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes. I notice one impact is not mentioned here, and it is going to have maybe a devastating impact on Goose Bay, and that is the social impact.

I finished school just as the Americans were moving in there and I was there for most of the time that the Americans were up there and this could be devastating. There could be broken homes because I heard that there was going to be about 15,000 possibly if a NATO base was there but that is not right. I heard since that there is going to be about possibly 7000 personnel which is approximately the population of Goose Bay at the present time.

So, even then, you are going to have several thousand unattached males, whether they are single or married, it does not make any difference, who are going to become sex-hungry males after a while.

I have known up there before where a man went home from a hunting trip a little early and found his wife in bed with an American airman or something like that. That is going to happen again, do not worry, because these airmen, no matter which country they come from, they are not made out of stone. That is going to be the biggest impact; it is going to be bigger than the environmental impact up there. They probably do not realize it yet but I have seen it happen. If they are willing to pay that price, and, of course, some of the women would be delighted, whether they are married or single, whether they are looking for thrills or whatever else.

Another thing, on a military base, any military club, any woman can walk in, any time, without being signed in,and a man cannot. He has to be signed in, whether he is the woman's husband or whatever.

After a while, there is going to be a bit of friction. I have seen that happen before, with the military.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any other questions to ask about the project?

Yes, sir?

MR. MICHELIN: What I would like to know is roughly how many aircraft will be in Goose Bay if we are successful in having the NATO base?

MAJOR McCABE: One of the problems of this, as I tried to bring out in my presentation, is the ideal for the NATO centre; the maximum that they are looking at is about 136 fighter-type aircraft being there at any one time.

Now, as we understand it, the majority

of the low level activity would continue as well. So I suppose we could see upwards of 200 aircraft being there, if the NATO centre were to be built at its full scale.

Now, if it is put in half-size, then, obviously, you are going to have a smaller number.

MR. MICHELIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHIWAK: May I make another comment on something else?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, please go ahead.

MR. SHIWAK: I think I would back the Indians in their fight against it because they are not accepted socially or any other way up there in the valley right now.

I have stayed with friends who said they are lazy, they drink, they live off our tax dollars and so on and they are not willing to work.

Well, maybe in their lifestyle they have never had to work. They got along without the white people before they ever came. They did not work then for a wage.

Not only that, I have heard comments, I have heard things on the radio and I have heard comments by Herb Brett that he made in Montreal and he said the Indians' lifestyle is getting a load of Pampers and some canned food and going into the country until it is gone and coming back again, that that is their lifestyle.

Then, in St. John's, he said that he did not want any animosity between them and the Indians. Well, if that does not cause animosity, what he said in Montreal, I do not know what will. If I were them, I would fight tooth and nail, like they are doing, because they are not going to get the jobs.

First of all, they do not have the skills or the know how to qualify for the jobs and they are just not accepted in the mainstream of Canadian life or whatever.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

If there are no other questions at this time, then I would like to thank Major McCabe for his presentation. There may be other questions later and I am sure we will be able to make time for those.

MR. MICHELIN: Can I make a short announcement for a minute?

THE CHAIRMAN: Another question?

MR. MICHELIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MICHELIN: But not concerning him, not concerning him at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly, certainly. Thank you, Major.

MR. MICHELIN: Okay, thank you. Kenny Michelin again.

I would just like to let the public

people here know in the meeting that we had a short meeting with this Panel here today and the reason why Mr. Barnes gave us a little brief on the Draft Guidelines was because we said that we were not aware of it, that some of us Councillors did not have anything. We felt that the public did not get any, either. So Mr. Barnes was kind enough to fill us in and let us know what was going on. That is why he started off the meeting the way he did, to let us know what was going on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the explanation.

We have now been going for nearly an hour and a half. Would anybody suggest that we have a break, a short break, at this point?

We have sometimes found it useful to have a short break so people can go and look at the maps on the wall or speak to, perhaps, the Major or one of us before we go on to hear the presentations.

How would you people feel about that? We can either do that or we can skip the break and go directly into the presentations.

MR. MICHELIN: My presentation is very short.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, let us go on then for the time being. I believe Mr. Shiwak would like to ask another question.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes. What exactly is your mandate? Can you just recommend or can you actually stop or say go ahead or what on the NATO base?

The other one is: You do not have anything to say about what is going on now with Holland, Germany and Britain, do you?

THE CHAIRMAN: On the first question, the Panel has a mandate only to recommend concerning the establishment or otherwise of the NATO training centre.

The decision power rests with the Government of Canada and to a large extent, of course, with the Minister of National Defence but, certainly, in consultation with his colleagues in the government.

On your second question concerning the ongoing activities, the Panel has not been asked to recommend to the government whether those activities should continue or should be stopped. So we do not have a mandate to make such a recommendation.

MR. SHIWAK: And the government does not have to heed your recommendation, in any case, right?

THE CHAIRMAN: You are correct there, that is right.

MR. SHIWAK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The government has the power to make the decision and to take advice from wherever they wish or to leave it, that is correct.

I think it would be a good idea to break for approximately five minutes or so.

Before we do, there may be some people

here who would like to get on the mailing list for this project, to receive announcements, receive certain documents like the Draft Guidelines and that sort of thing.

There are two people here tonight who serve on the Secretariat to the Panel. During this break, you could go and speak to them and give them your name and address and get on the mailing list and, at the same time, you could also ask for copies of documents that have already been issued, such as the Terms of Reference of the Panel or the procedures document that the Panel has issued to indicate how it is going to carry out this whole review or you could, for example, ask to receive a transcript of this meeting or a transcript of any other meeting that we are having.

So I am going to identify those two people to you now.

First of all, Mr. Michel Bourgon with his hand up or Mr. Jim Clarke. Either one would be quite pleased to hear from you during the break.

Please feel free to look at the maps on the wall, to talk to any of us on the Panel, if you wish, or to talk to Major McCabe. We will come back in five minutes or so and continue the meeting.

Thank you.

---Short recess-

---Upon resuming

THE CHAIRMAN: There are two residen

of Rigolet who have indicated they would like to speak tonight. One of those is Mr. Bill Shiwak who is seated at the table over there, so I would ask him if he would like to go ahead now with his presentation.

You have something you would like to say?

MR. SHIWAK: No, I have nothing written.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry. I thought you had something put together that you wanted to say to the Panel tonight. You have nothing else that you want to say just at this time, then, do you?

MR. SHIWAK: Well, I was going to ask the Major a question, if I may.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, certainly. Go right ahead, please.

MR. SHIWAK: Is this thing on?

Sir, this low level flying, I assume, is to escape radar detection, to be able to fly into the Soviet Union or wherever without being detected by radar.

That suggests to me not a defensive thing but an offensive strategy or whatever.

MAJOR McCABE: That is your opinion and I respect that.

NATO has always, ever since it has been established, had what we call a policy of flexible response.

If, for example, the NATO countries

are attacked and hostilities start, then, obviously, we are into a war with each side attacking each other and you have targets in the enemy territory that you want to try and reach and they are protected by radar.

You are correct, that is to try and avoid radar. Then they have to fly low. It is not necessarily an offensive thing in the sense that we are practicing it so we can go and get a first hit at these guys. It is not that, if that is what you are implying.

MR. SHIWAK: If conventional war breaks out -- I suppose I have to ask you for your personal opinion -- do you think it is going to stop, say, if Russia starts losing or the States starts losing, do you think they are not going to use these atomic weapons?

MAJOR McCABE: Well, obviously, what I would give you is very much a personal opinion, since I would probably have a good chance of being involved in it. Since I am a pilot, I would hope that it would stop at that but, then, there are a lot of people, as you well know, who have different opinions on that. It is not something that I can give you any kind of a formal response on.

Everyone hopes that it would not happen at all and, if it did happen, it would be very short and only conventional. But I cannot really give you the response that you are probably looking for.

MR. SHIWAK: And if they use these atomic weapons, we are definitely a target, right, if we become a NATO training centre here?

MAJOR McCABE: Okay. I am glad you brought that up because that has come up at other places.

I can assure you -- and this is not opinion -- I can assure you that is not the case.

Training facilities, training bases, are not targets. The primary targets in a situation you are talking about are what we call operational bases, the kind of bases we have established in Europe where there are people whose job is to fight, the front line people. That is a primary kind of target, or an industrial centre.

In time of hostilities, just in time of tension, for example, the aircraft here that would be training would be going back home to Europe. So you would end up with no training activities, probably, going on.

So, no, it would not become any kind of a primary target.

MR. SHIWAK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do have Mr. Max Blake as another registered speaker.

Once we have heard from him, we would be glad to have more questions from other people of the community.

Mr. Blake, would you like to go to

Blake, Sub.

the table now, please?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. MAX BLAKE:

MR. MAX BLAKE: Yes. I would just like to say that I am against it because, for one reason, our silence will be spoiled and ruined, our wilderness silence will be ruined and, another thing, there will be all kinds of Newfoundlanders and other outsiders coming here, taking all the jobs and killin all our game and spoiling our country, taking over like they have been doing for the last few years, eve since the Linerboard and the base, coming around, killing all our partridges and catching all our trout and hunting the same as we can and catching all the fish the same as we can.

There should be a stop put to it. We should be allowed to kill more than they are and we should be allowed to catch more fish than they are.

We do not need them, we do not need them here, as far as I am concerned. They are only jobs for the outsiders.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Blake.

Now, as I said before, there is a representative of the Labrador Inuit Association here tonight who has indicated a desire to speak to the community and to the Panel but it is always the custo of a Panel in holding a public meeting, particularly in a small community, to give the first opportunity to the residents of that community to be heard and then, with the agreement of the community, to invite persons from outside the community to speak.

So I want to make sure that we give every chance to anyone from Rigolet to speak first.

So is there anyone else from here who would like to speak? You might have something to say or you might have a question, whichever.

Yes, sir?

MR. MICHELIN: If you say you have some more speakers, maybe the ones that we have could speak first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have only one more on the list and that is a person from outside of the community. That is a person who is not a resident of this community. So I would save that speaker until last, after everyone who is here has had his or her say.

So, if you would like to say something, please go ahead. No? Well, is there anyone else, then, who would like to speak? We would welcome any questions about the project being proposed or about this review process, if there is something you feel you do not understand completely.

Yes, sir, go ahead. Would you please use the microphone?

MR. MICHELIN: My name?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

MR. MICHELIN: Kenny Michelin.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MICHELIN: Another thing I would like to know is, if Goose Bay should be the base for NATO, how much changed will Goose Bay be from the way the place is right now? What changes will it go through?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything particular in mind? What type of change?

MR. MICHELIN: Well, like I say, you have expansion of a lot of people coming in, a lot of planes and people coming in, working. How will it change the lives of people in Goose Bay or us? Can people in Goose Bay go on as they do now and do what they want or will they have to go by guidelines as to what they can and cannot do up around there?

THE CHAIRMAN: The sort of broader effects that you seem to be asking about, I believe, are something that we are going to be trying to find out over the course of the next year and a half or so in this study.

If you are asking about the actual operation of the military facility there and how that might be accessible or otherwise used by civilian people, I believe that Major McCabe might be able to give some sort of answer at the present time.

Would you, Major?

MAJOR McCABE: I have tried to give a basic idea of the sort of changes which might be seen on the physical side, as far as things that might be built.

Obviously, a lot of the existing facilities, the social facilities, recreational facilities and that, would be expanded.

There is no intention to get back to the old days of the «them» and «us» business, with a gate closing off the entire base and all the rest of it to the civilian community.

We have spent many years, particularly since the withdrawal of the United States Air Force, working on improving the relations between the local community and the military people that come in there. We have an excellent rapport with the people there; the military folks get very involved with the local community in many activities and I would see that continuing.

With reference to, say, security, et cetera, on the airfield, there really would not be any increase in security than exists right now. Any airfield because of the danger of the airplanes and that, be it civilian or military, has to have a fenced off area and it is fenced off right now. I do not see any change happening to go back to the old days that I think a lot of people are concerned about.

I do not know if that answers your question, Mr. Michelin, enough. Is that okay?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Would somebody else like to say something?

Yes, sir. Would you please go to either microphone and give your name first, please.

MR. MAX POTTLE: Is there anyone here from the Wildlife Division or the Wildlife Department?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not to my knowledge, sir. There is one wildlife biologist, that is to say, at least one wildlife biologist, on the Panel. If you would care to ask something about wildlife, it might be possible to provide some sort of an answer.

Is that what you wish to do?

MR. POTTLE: I just want to know if there's a NATO base in Goose Bay, will hunting and fishing be done away with? Could it be possible?

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you mean, «done away with»? In terms of spoiled in some way or prohibited? What do you mean?

MR. POTTLE: Will low level flying destroy the deer migration and all this? The ducks and geese?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I do not think that the possible effects on wildlife are one thing -- let me start again. The possible effects on wildlife are going to be examined as part of this study that we are involved in here now. It is a bit early in the game to speculate on what those effects might be. I think that is part of why we are here now, to find out the questions that are going to be asked.

It is too early now to be giving

answers like that.

I think there are other facilities, somewhat similar to what might be established at Goose Bay, elsewhere in Canada and perhaps elsewhere in the world that could be looked at to serve as examples of the sorts of things that can happen at a military facility like this.

Information from those places could be used to help the proponent predict what effect there might be on the wildlife in Labrador as a result of this proposed project.

MR. POTTLE: But there is study going on, is there?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one caribou study that is going on at the present time, yes, that is being carried out under contract for the Newfoundland Wildlife Division. That will provide certain information on both the George River caribou herd and the Red Wine caribou herd.

MR. POTTLE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to give one more chance to a resident of this community before I ask the person from the Labrador Inuit Association to speak.

MR. MICHELIN: Kenny Michelin again.

Another thing I would like to know is what effect would it do to us on noise, like, for our hearing and things like that? Have things been checked into regarding that?

I hear a lot of talk about it, saying it could affect us in some way and I would just like to know something about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a study going on at the present time, being conducted by the Canadian Public Health Association, at the request of the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Health which is looking at the effects of noise from low flying aircraft on people, both physical effects and psychological effects and other sorts of effects.

There was one interim report published by the CPHA a short time ago and we are expecting a final report on that study to be published some time this fall. That will be made available to everyone.

That will certainly provide some information on that subject that could be used by National Defence in writing its Impact Statement.

So, to answer your question quickly, there is a study ongoing now on that subject.

MR. MICHELIN: What about pollution from the planes and that, too? I guess you must have something in the works on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the Guidelines prepared by the Panel do call for examination of that question, to look at whatever information there may be available from elsewhere and to obtain some information from the local area in an attempt to answer that question.

MR. MICHELIN: If Goose Bay is not

successful in getting that NATO base in Goose Bay, what we were talking about a few minutes ago earlier, you say that, if Goose Bay did have it, we will not be a target for war and, even if we are not, the way Goose Bay is going now, military-wise, we will be bigger than Europe before we even know it because it is increasing all the time.

I think everyone can see that. I am sure I can. It is, as I said, expanding all the time and it looks like it is just going to keep on going until everything is there. That is what I think, anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Well, I would now like to call on Sharon Edmunds to make a presentation on behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association.

---SUBMISSION BY MS SHARON EDMUNDS:

MS SHARON EDMUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. People are quite anxious to know how long I am going to take. Hopefully, you will be able to bear with me.

My name is Sharon Edmunds. I am the environmental advisor to the Labrador Inuit Association.

As was mentioned in Nain, because of the length of our presentation, we have divided it into three parts. At this point, I will be presenting Part II. This section deals with general concerns with reference to the Draft Guidelines. Part III which includes specific comments on the Guidelines

Edmunds, Sub.

will be presented tomorrow evening in Makkovik.

Before I begin, I would suggest to the Panel that you have your Draft Guidelines near you, because some reference will be made to the Guidelines.

To start, I would, first of all, like to address the issue of public notice on the amendments to the Terms of Reference.

When the Panel was in Nain on the 28th of October, 1986, LIA was very surprised to learn that the Panel members were unaware of the amendments to the Terms of Reference. LIA has received a copy of the letter dated 1 October, 1986, from the Minister of Environment to David Barnes, Chairman of this Panel, advising him of certain amendments to the Terms of Reference.

Accordingly, LIA would like to know if, one, the Terms of Reference have been made public; two, if they have not, why are they not public yet and when can we expect them to become public?

I will continue with the LIA response to the Guidelines and await a response from the Panel Chairman at the end of this presentation, if that is all right with you.

Preamble: LIA has made its concerns known about the prejudice we believe that results from the Memorandum of Understanding and the Panel's Terms of Reference. LIA's response to the Draft Guidelines

Edmunds, Sub.

is prepared in the context of these concerns because the Guidelines can only be understood and interpreted in the context of the Memorandum of Understanding and the Panel's Terms of Reference.

We also wish to remind the Panel that, when the Panel Secretariat came to meet us in Nain in August as part of the scoping exercise used to develop the Draft Guidelines, they handed out the Draft Guidelines for our comments at that time. The FEARO representatives cancelled three meetings in Nain, some because of a combination of weather factors and the need to meet other scheduling requirements in the round of scoping workshops.

There was no opportunity to influence those Guidelines before they were released to the public. LIA simply received the copy of the Draft Guidelines when the FEARO representatives came to Nain.

LIA was asked to put its concerns about the project in writing to the Panel. This was in early August. LIA submitted its concerns to the Panel and it was a result of the specific questions in writing abou how the Panel was proceeding in reviewing the project related impacts in Quebec that we learned about the Memorandum of Understanding and became concerned about the possibility of prejudice to the Labrador Inuit.

We have discovered that the Naskapi of Quebec and the Kativik Regional Government

Edmunds, Sub.

negotiated with FEARO to establish the Memorandum of Understanding which in turn governs the Terms of Reference for this review process and also were consulted in drafting the Terms of Reference for the Panel. We do not know who else was part of this process, but we do know that LIA was not.

We also note that when the public meetings began on the Draft Guidelines, they began in la Romaine, Quebec, and that all of the Quebec interests were addressed in the scoping exercise prior to releasing the Draft Guidelines.

FEARO has released the names of the people it has hired as technical experts to the Panel. We note that, of the 11 experts identified, they have hired 10. Six of these experts are from Quebec-based companies. To our knowledge, no expert for or from Labrador has yet been hired.

The expert that FEARO has chosen to advise the Panel on caribou-related matters is from Quebec. He is acting as secretariat for the Hunting, Trapping and Fishing Co-ordination Committee set up under the JBNQA, as a wildlife management body with representation from the Crees, Naskapi, Inuit of Quebec and the federal government and the Quebec government. While this body is essentially an advisory body to the Ministère de Loisir, Chasse et Pêche, the one area where it has decision-making powers is in determining the upper limit of kill of

Edmunds, Sub.

caribou in Quebec.

The fact that the secretary for the Co-ordinating Committee is also the technical advisor to this Panel is significant, because of the position occupied by Dr. Paul Wilkinson on the Co-ordinating Committee as already pointed out above.

It is also significant because there has been a history of disagreement between Newfoundland and Quebec wildlife managers about important issues respecting management of the George River caribou herd. Yet, so far, all appointments in relation to this review provide for representation by Quebec interests without recognition of Newfoundland and Labrador interests.

LIA considers that one of the major management problems of the George River caribou herd is the lack of intergovernmental joint management. The other major caribou herds in Canada have or are about to form joint management caribou boards. There is one for the Beverly Kaminuriak herd in the Northwest Territories, and one for the Porcupine caribou herd in the Yukon. These joint management boards have representation from all governments who have management jurisdiction over the herd as it crosses political boundaries and from all the major Aboriginal users. The management board then proceeds to develop a management plan that manages the herd in total and its habitat.

LIA has been pushing for a similar

Edmunds, Sub.

management board for the George River caribou herd. We have made it an issue at our Quebec negotiating table, we have written to and met with appropriate Ministers in Quebec, Newfoundland and Canada. We made a submission to Quebec's inquiry on the drowning of the 10,000 animals on the Caniapiscau River and we recommended joint management. We attended the Beverly Kaminuriak Joint Management Board meeting in White Horse in August 1985 and made a presentation about the need for a similar board for the George River caribou herd.

We have discovered that, while many people in fact agree with the principle of intergovernmental joint management, it does not happen because of the history of political tension between Newfoundland and Quebec. The political sensitivities have, in our opinion, created real management crises with the herd. The antagonism extends all the way to the level of field technicians who are supposedly trying to work co-operatively in studying the herd.

We assume that the Department of Environment sits at the LIA negotiating table where the full range of issues respecting joint caribou management have been discussed and because of the various representations made to the Department of Environment by LIA over the years, that FEARO has full knowledge of the background climate. Yet, instead of choosing an independent caribou biologist,

Edmunds, Sub.

FEARO has chosen a Quebec biologist. By doing that, FEARO has simply antagonized the existing polarizatio

We have been reluctant to raise this issue again because we know that we have been pressin the same point consistently since September but we simply do not know when it is going to stop. We do not know who in all of this is there to ensure the process is honest. Quebec's interests are driving the process and nobody, not FEARO, the Panel, the Department of Environment, nor the Government of Newfoundland, have shown concern for respecting the geographic perspective of this project.

Accordingly, LIA recommends that the Panel also hire Labrador's regional biologist as an expert on caribou. He has worked for years with the George River herd, the Red Wine herd and the Mealy Mountain herd, all of which have been exposed to low level flying over the years.

LIA believes that these public meetings on the Draft Guidelines provide a good opportunity for the public to get comments into the Panel. We believe that it is also important to get comments from the Department of National Defence as the proponent on the acceptability of the Guidelines at this stage in the process.

Instead, on page 6 of the Draft Guidelines, it says:

«The proponent must obtain the

Edmunds, Sub.

> approval of the Panel before making any major changes or deviations from the required structure or contents on the Environmental Impact Statement. If the proponent judges that these Guidelines are not relevant to the project, he must identify the judgment in the EIS to the public, the Panel and the technical experts will have the opportunity to comment on that judgment. If the Panel disagrees with the proponent's judgment in this matter, it may require additional information or analysis from the proponent.»

At all of the public meetings so far, there has been a representative from DND who has been there to explain the project, to answer any technical questions relating to the project. LIA believes that it is essential to the process that DND provide its comments on the acceptability of the Draft Guidelines. In our experience with past EARPs, the proponent has made comments on the Draft Guidelines.

With reference to the question that I had raised to Major McCabe in Nain, I think it is appropriate to raise this concern again. The response that Major McCabe gave in Nain is exactly the kind of response that leads to asking the question and that

Edmunds, Sub.

is that DND may have a question on clarification on, for example, land claims. Yet, the Guidelines do not direct the proponent on how to deal with it. We intend to address this concern.

We would like to emphasize that, in order to make that particular Guideline meaningful, there has to be an exchange between the Panel, the proponent and the interested parties. We also believe this needs to be done in this type of forum before the final Guidelines are given to the proponent.

I will continue on and then we can exchange after.

Just as public comment is obviously important to the Panel in its preparation of the final Guidelines, so is the proponent's. The way FEARO has provided for DND's comments after the Guidelines are finalized suggests to us that the real determination of what eventually goes into the EIS will be bilateral agreements made outside the public review forum. All of the comments that the public are making will be nice to know but it may become meaningless if DND has fundamental objections to the Draft Guidelines.

It is difficult for the public to make a case for a position in the absence of a debate, especially given that the project description is so minimal.

The final Guidelines should reflect all the concerns of the public and the proponent and

Edmunds, Sub.

should be binding. Deviations from the EIS would then automatically constitute the need for deficiency statements. By allowing the proponent to defer its comments until after the Guidelines are finalized, it makes us wonder just what final Guidelines mean in this process.

LIA would like to hear DND's preliminary reactions to the Draft Guidelines and to the public comments that have been forthcoming since the beginning of September.

We are now very near the end of the public meetings on the Draft Guidelines, so we believe that this would be an appropriate time for such a reaction. We would then like time to consider DND's comments on the Draft Guidelines and then to make a reply to their comments by way of submissions to the Panel in order that the exchange of views can be taken into account by the Panel before the Guidelines are finalized.

LIA's comments on the Guidelines will be with general concerns and proceed from there to specific concerns. Wherever possible, we have included a suggested re-draft to cover our concerns.

General concerns: The Draft Guidelines are hard to understand, not only in the language that is used, but also in the general organization of the paper. The language in places like Section 4, Methodological Considerations, is

Edmunds, Sub.

particularly difficult to understand and even more difficult to translate into Inuktituk in a way that makes sense to people.

If the Panel hopes to get substantive comments on its documents, the documents must be written in a way that allows people to understand what is being said and must have as wide and as early a circulation as possible.

Timeframe: The Draft Guidelines appear to be very comprehensive and, certainly, in LIA's experience, represent the best effort that we have seen to establish Guidelines for an EIS. However, LIA understands that, once the Guidelines are finalized and presented to the proponent, that we should expect the EIS to be completed in approximately nine months so the public meetings on the EIS could possibly begin in the fall of 1987.

The Letter of Referral from the Associate Deputy Minister of the Department of National Defence to the Minister of Environment clearly establishes DND's timetable as one that is tied in with the critical path on the selection process of a site for the NATO base.

We believe the schedule is quite unrealistic. We do not believe that the proponent can do an honest job in preparing an EIS that respects the Guidelines within the timeframe established for this review.

Edmunds, Sub.

LIA believes that it is important to be honest to the proponent and to the public and provide Guidelines that clearly state that the timeframe as initially indicated by DND will not be the driving force behind the EIS but that full compliance with the Guidelines will be.

If this cannot be done, we wonder whether there is any point in proceeding further with the process.

We appreciate that the Panel can ask for deficiency statements from the proponent once it has submitted the EIS but, obviously, this would not be the preferred way to operate. LIA believes that much of what the Guidelines require simply do not exist. For example, base line data on birds and terrestrial mammals in the areas of low level over lights in Labrador is very scarce, particularly with reference to the following species: caribou, moose, polar bear, black bear, wolverine, wolf, lynx, hare, porcupine, mink, muskrat, otter, beaver, lemming and marten.

We are not sure but we also expect that water quality data, as requested in Guideline 6.4.3, may also be severely deficient. Supplying the data to fill the base line deficiencies alone would take longer than one year. LIA is concerned that the proponent will be able to argue, justifiably, that it cannot address such data gaps within the timeframe

Edmunds, Sub.

established in the Guidelines. We do not want to see the Guidelines undermined by an unrealistic timeframe.

Recommendation: The Guidelines should add a statement to say that the Panel will not convene public hearings on the EIS until the proponent has adequately provided all the necessary information and analyses consistent with the intent of the Guidelines.

Data Gaps: Throughout the Draft Guidelines, there are references to provisions for the proponent to identify instances where it cannot meet Guidelines' requirements. If you would like to turn to page 11, for example:

> «The terms used to describe the significance of project induced changes in valued ecosystem components must be unambiguously defined. If they cannot be so defined, adequate reasons must be given and the consequences of the absence of such unambiguous definitions must be identified.»

This is page 11.

Again, at page 11:

> «The predictive analysis should be described.»

And it goes on:

> «Reasons should be given if any of

Edmunds, Sub.

> the above cannot be described.»

That one was at page 11.

> «The extent and nature of any knowledge gaps should be identified, particularly where such deficiencies have affected the prediction of certain impacts.»

This was at page 32.

Under the Description of the Existing Environment, the Guidelines clearly state:

> «Where data are not available and cannot reasonably be collected, the proponent should note their unavailability and should describe his efforts to obtain them. The implications of any such data gaps for the quality of the EIS and, in particular, for the reliability of any predictions of impact should be discussed.»

Page 27.

LIA finds these statements as a general principle to be completely unacceptable.

We are participating in this review for the single purpose of assessing and analyzing the relevant facts and issues. We accept that there are areas where collecting relevant data is impossible. We feel very strongly, however, that those areas should be specifically identified in the

Edmunds, Sub.

Guidelines and the Guidelines should direct the proponent to address contingencies for dealing with those deficiencies in the overall analysis of impacts.

There is an imbalance in the base line information available in Quebec and in Labrador. In Labrador, the proponent will have a very difficult time addressing the Guidelines under Section 6.4. Very generally, the information is not there. There will also be difficulty getting quantitative data on Native harvests in Labrador.

In northern Quebec, as a result of the JBNQA, there have been comprehensive harvest studies for the Crees and the Inuit and all species harvested. The results of these studies provide a far more complete picture of the wildlife populations and harvesting patterns in northern Quebec.

How will the proponent account for the fact that the best data will likely be available in Quebec and the concentration of the project related activities will be in Labrador?

LIA is concerned that impact prediction and analysis may become skewed because of this. We fear that the degree of impact prediction for Labrador Inuit could become compromised if the proponent does not account for the differences between Quebec and Labrador, not only in the availability of the data but also for areas of primary and secondary impact.

For this exercise to be meaningful

Edmunds, Sub.

to all of us, we must identify at the Guidelines stage what can realistically be achieved through this process.

Our specific concern here is to get an understanding of the impacts of low level flying on caribou, in particular on the George River caribou herd. Because of the ongoing controversy over this issue and because of the importance of the caribou to Aboriginal peoples in northern Labrador, it has become a central concern.

A two-year study, funded jointly by the provincial government and the federal government Department of Environment, is attempting to look at the impacts of low level flying on the Red Wine caribou herd with incidental observations on the George River animals. However, without conserving the limitations of the study itself, the results will not be available for another two years, presumably well after this EARP is completed.

The independent consultant hired to carry out this study has completed the first field session and, as a result of poor co-operation from DND and other NATO countries operating out of Goose Bay, despite all of their promises, assurances and financial contributions to the study, there may be no reliable data from this summer. The problems encountered by the study team with DND are fully documented and will form part of the consultant's progress report to the steering committee in December.

Edmunds, Sub.

This caribou study was initiated because there is inadequate data on the impacts of military low level flying on caribou in Labrador. The proponent will not be able to provide it in nine months and the current study may not provide in two years.

Accordingly, LIA believes that, with reference to caribou, the Guidelines should state that the EIS should provide, among other things, the description of the existing data base, a description of an analysis of relevant analog evidence appropriate to the issue of potential impacts on low level flying military aircraft on caribou, proposals for contingency actions for dealing with issues of impacts on caribou in the face of crucial data gaps.

This issue is too important to lump with other data deficiencies that we can perhaps live with. If the Guidelines do not do this, we will be no further ahead one year from now than we are today.

Recommendation: With respect to caribou, the Panel should recognize the special problems associated with getting any reliable data on potential impacts on caribou from military low level flying. The Guidelines should state that the proponent must include as a minimum the base line data requirements outside in Section 6.4.4 and must distinguish between the Red Wine herd and the George River herd, must provide relevant analog evidence and

Edmunds, Sub.

must detail contingency action proposals for dealings with effects on caribou as a result of military low level flying that may become apparent is the project is authorized.

As a general principle, where the proponent identifies a major or significant data gap that affects the determination and analysis of impacts, the proponent should propose contingency plans for dealing with this situation.

Future changes to the current proposal: If you would like to turn to page 18, Section 6.2.4 of the Guidelines deals with future phases of the project by saying that the proponent must describe any known future phases of the project.

Our experience with DND over the past six years has taught us to be very cautious of this type of wording. In 1980, when DND met with the public in Goose Bay to describe the Luftwaffe activities, we asked DND what all of this meant for the future. We asked what to expect in the way of more bilateral agreements with Canada for use of Labrador for low level training.

We were assured that the number of planes would not increase without further consultation and were not informed of the intention to include any further bilateral agreements.

Despite assurances from DND about ongoing consultation and monitoring of low level flying,

Edmunds, Sub.

when we started to hear rumours of a NATO base in Goose Bay a few years ago, we could not get DND to confirm it. We could not get DND to acknowledge the responsibility of use of live weapons and we were assured several times that live weapons were not contemplated at the time that we asked questions.

We are afraid that the same approach will be used in the EIS. DND will say: It is not our intention to use live weapons or a sea range, but three years from now, it will be a different story.

It is part of the ongoing frustration in dealing with DND. DND defuses and exhausts public efforts to stay on top of what happens and we end up watching the original proposal increase by increments each year, either more planes for the Luftwaffe, two more countries with bilateral agreements, another bombing range, expanded flight corridors, and on it goes.

Recommendation: Guideline 6.2.4 should read: The proponent must describe all potential future phases of the project, no matter how remote they may be considered at this stage and must, in addition, and it continues on as it reads.

The proponent must also address ways in which future phases and/or change to the project will occur and how it will deal with the problem of potential impacts of future phases on environmental components where no base line data has been collected.

Edmunds, Sub.

Consultation: LIA has had problems dealing with DND right from the beginning, probably because DND and LIA have a different understanding of just what public consultation is.

DND's initial approach in 1980 was to do a public relations campaign and then disappear. We were given lots of phone numbers, most of them in Ottawa, and after the dust settled, we were left wondering what hit us. The past six years has been an exercise in constant frustration.

DND emphasizes that it consults extensively on the selection of land sites currently proposed for the bombing ranges, et cetera. DND has never consulted with LIA with the selection criteria or the selection process. DND, however, has offered to fly some of our people over the proposed sites to look at them.

LIA believes that, if there is to be any meaningful co-operation between DND and LIA, there must be ongoing consultation that allows us to be part of the process, not just an information receiver.

Recommendation: Section 5 of the Guidelines should include, as part (10). The need to describe in detail how the proponent intends to provide for ongoing consultation with key resource users who may be impacted by the project and its future phases. The consultation process should reflect and respect the major areas of impact and people impacted.

Edmunds, Sub.

Primary area of impact: For a long time now, and especially since 1980, with the arrival of the Luftwaffe, we have been living with the impacts of increased low level flying and escalating military activity in Labrador.

We live with the impacts; we see them, we hear them, we sfeel them and there is an ever-present force in Labrador.

LIA has been dealing with government and industry for six years now, trying to address the problem. The NMIA have campaigned in Europe and across the country to try and stop the increased militarization in Labrador. There is no denying that Labrador and Labrador Inuit and Innu have been the focus for the past six years of all low level flying training programs.

The bombing ranges are in Labrador, the proposed NATO base is in Goose Bay and, yet, nowhere in the Guidelines, except for page 5, is there any mention of the geographic boundaries of the project, never mind recognition of the concentration of activities in Labrador. Goose Bay, as the NATO base location, is the only geographic reference point.

By combining Quebec and Labrador into one review through the Memorandum of Understanding and the Terms of Reference, our close proximity to regular interference with low level flying is denied any recognition.

Edmunds, Sub.

It is as if, in order to protect Quebec's interest, we do not mention Labrador.

If you remove the cover page from the Draft Guidelines, a reader could be excused for not knowing where all of this activity is taking place, apart from knowing that the NATO base may be located at Goose Bay.

LIA pays a heavy price for not having its land claims settled. In this review alone, we are prejudiced by the Terms of Reference that give priority consideration to Quebec native parties and we are prejudiced, once again, by having all reference to Labrador removed from the Guidelines and all reference to Labrador being the potential area of primary impact.

It may be more advantageous for government to have one review and it is certainly more advantageous for Quebec, because it expands the scope for them.

It is clearly degrading for us. We certainly never anticipated an EARP on low level flying that could so completely deny our geographic identity and our special vulnerability to the activities.

Recommendation: Include a statement under Guideline 2.0 that says:

> «The major portion of the activities associated with the project occur in or over Labrador and, as such, may

Edmunds, Sub.

> generate the major impacts in the territory and on the residents of Labrador.»

A sentence should be added to the end of Guideline 6.4 to say:

> «This information should be compiled in a manner that reflects the concentration of activities and the probability of high degree of impact.»

In the second last paragraph, a sentence should be added to Guideline 6.5 to say:

> «Impacts should be described separately for Labrador Inuit, Labrador Innu and the Quebec native parties.»

Add to the first sentence of Guideline 6.8:

> «...and must identify and address any optional problems that may be encountered by interprovincial jurisdictions.»

Scope: The full scope of the Panel's mandate on the issue of low level flying is limited to «designing these activities further to minimize any adverse impacts», page 7.

LIA believes that the Panel's mandate should be broadened to allow the Panel to make recommendations about halting low level flying if evidence of the impacts suggest that they would be

Edmunds, Sub.

unacceptable or if it is impossible to make any judgments based on inadequate data.

This would certainly be consistent with the spirit of Recommendation 3 from the Standing Committee on Environment and Forestry, June 1986, which says:

> «The Minister of National Defence should immediately halt all north shore and Labrador low level flying air flights and assess the effects of such flights on the environment in these regions as soon as possible»,

page 16.

Recommendation: Section 3, page 7, after (a), add:

> «The mandate of the Panel will include calling for a moratorium on low level flying in the event that
>
> (1) no clear analysis of impacts can be determined through this EARP and more time and study is required; or
>
> (2) the Panel determines that the impacts are unacceptable.»

The issues: The Panel refers in the second of its identified issues in Section 5, page 13, to subsistence lifestyles and land use. These words are used again throughout Section 6.4.5.

Edmunds, Sub.

Each of these words is problematic. One cannot break out subsistence or the meaning of «subsistence» or try to define it independent of the culture of Aboriginal peoples. The use of the word «subsistence» is an attempt to identify the economic activities of Aboriginal peoples in a given way.

It is an attempt to draw distinctions between activities undertaken for cash and profit and for those undertaken for food, clothing, social exchange and social maintenance. As an attempt, it fails because the distinctions are meaningless.

The word «lifestyles» is more problematic because it is inherently insulting. It minimizes the fact that Aboriginal peoples have a distinct culture and way of life. The word «lifestyles» is a faddish word that gained real popularity in the 60s and 70s when members of the dominant society were in search of alternate lifestyles within the dominant society.

The word suggests fashion, appearance and form in a way that demeans Aboriginal culture and undervalues it.

Recommendation: Issue (2) should be re-drafted to say:

> «(2) The effects of low level military training on the economies, culture and land use of Aboriginal peoples.»

Similar changes should be made throughout Section 6.4.5.

Edmunds, Sub.

LIA welcomes the fact that the Panel has identified the effects on the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims as an important issue, requiring in-depth analysis. LIA welcomes this initiative by the Panel but we would like to point out the following:

(a) Nowhere does Part 6, dealing with the contents of the Environmental Impact Statement, identify how the proponent is to address this important issue;

(b) The Terms of Reference, the Panel and the Guidelines have failed to give recognition to the fact that Aboriginal peoples are now recognized and protected by the Canadian Constitution. This means that the rights of Aboriginal peoples are no longer something to be considered as a matter of policy. Their rights are now to be accorded recognition and protection and the proponent should address this independent of the issue of settlement of claims;

(c) The Panel has drawn a fine distinction between the subject of land claims policy and the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims. It is critical to know whether or not the proponent accepts this characterization of the issues and the Panel's mandate;

(d) Aboriginal peoples prefer the distinction "Aboriginal land claims" rather than the

Edmunds, Sub.

word «native» with a lower case «N».

Impacts on wildlife: We constantly hear people say that there has been low level flying and intense periods of military activity around the base in Goose Bay and in Labrador in the past, and it has not negatively affected the environment or the wildlife in the area.

Statements like this seem to hang around and are never challenged. We do not accept statements like this.

If we look at the history of low level flying activity, which began around 1967, and look at the situation of the Mealy Mountain caribou herd, we see a correlation with its demise and military activity.

The first study was done on the Mealy Mountain caribou herd in 1958. It indicated a population of 2000 to 2500 animals at the time. By 1974/1975, the herd numbered less than 300 animals.

There was no resident biologist at that time, so there was no systematic monitoring of the herd or of the pressures on it. We know there was over-kill from hunting. That has been documented. But other forms of over-kill, like accounts in the past of military people killing caribou from aircraft, have not been documented.

We know that this does not provide any hard evidence of what factors are ultimately responsible for the decline of the Mealy Mountain caribou herd but we believe it is a dimension of the issue which is consistently ignored but must be analyzed. Until this happens, statements that low level flying has not been responsible for negative impacts on our wildlife are simply unfounded.

We also hear statements made by, among others, military personnel and, more recently, by John Crosbie, Minister of Transport, that recent low level flying since 1980 has made the stags in the George River herd «macho», that low level flying has been a stimulus to the growth of the herd.

Statements like this are ridiculous, demeaning and insulting to us because they are a response to our concerns about damage to or interference with caribou.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could say that that sort of comment is not pertinent to the content of the Guidelines, and I really do not see that that needs to be made at this time.

The other thing I would say is I would ask you to finish up within the next five minutes, in fairness to the residents of this community.

MS EDMUNDS: Yes, I am just about finished.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS EDMUNDS: I will continue on.

In fact, the George River caribou herd appears to have experienced its best growth rate in

Edmunds, Sub.

the late 1960s and early 1970s when, coincidentally, there was a lull in military activity associated with Goose Bay.

Our point is simple. The Panel must not accept as fact that the statements that low level flying and associated military activity in the past has had no negative impacts on wildlife or on the environment in Labrador, nor should the Panel give any credence to statements that low level flying has stimulated the growth of the George River caribou herd.

There must be careful review and analysis of all historical evidence documented and empirical of wildlife patterns and behaviour prior to the establishment of the military base at Goose Bay and correlations with military activities must be carefully analyzed.

Along with the increased low level flying and the potential NATO base will come many more people. These people will come with money and leisure time and this will result in pressure for access to our wildlife resources.

Right now, the number of licenses for moose in the northern zone can hardly satisfy the current demand. We may end up having seasons or limits on partridge, something that we hunt freely now, so the government can accommodate demands for more and more sport and recreational hunting.

The EIS must address the potential

Edmunds, Sub.

impact of an increase in people and a subsequent increase in pressure on the access to our wildlife resources.

That ends the presentation to this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Even though it may take up a few minutes from this meeting, I think there are several points that I would like to respond to at the present time.

You asked a question at the beginning concerning what you refer to as Amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Panel.

I presume that you are referring to a letter to me, as the Chairman of the Panel, by the Minister of the Environment.

I should point out that the effect of that letter, the aim of that letter, is not so much to change the Terms of Reference of the Panel as to draw to the attention of the Panel the importance of giving just as much consideration to the interests and concerns of people living in Labrador as to those of people living in the Province of Quebec.

This relates to the Memorandum of Understanding which forms a part of the Terms of Reference and which the Labrador Inuit Association has chosen to interpret as being prejudicial against that Association.

I would like to say that the Panel

Edmunds, Sub.

does not agree with the Association's interpretation on that matter.

The items in that Memorandum of Understanding relating to the fact that certain considerations must be kept in mind in the course of this review are really only statements of certain principles which have been well accepted for a long time in the carrying out of Environmental Impact Statements and which would have, indeed, been followed by this Panel with regard to all populations which may be affected by this project, even if the Memorandum of Understanding had not existed at all.

The letter to the Panel from the Minister was, indeed, dated early in October. However, I should point out that this Panel has been on the road, so to speak, for a great part of the month of October. The letter was at my office last week when I arrived back after one of the previous rounds of meetings. As you say, a copy had already been sent to the Labrador Inuit Association. Copies of the letter were put in the mail to the other members of this Panel but, in the cases of some of the members, I would suspect that it did not have time to arrive at the destinations of the letters before the Panel had already departed for another round of meetings. That may explain why some of the Panel members had not seen that letter.

The letter is now a part of the publi

file in this review. It is certainly available to anybody who would care to see it.

I do not know that it would have been sent out automatically as a mass mailing to all people on the mailing list because, as I say, it really is directed to the Panel by way of drawing its attention to something which the Minister regarded as important but does not have the force of really changing the intent of the Terms of Reference.

You have complained that the Draft Guidelines document was put in the hands of the Labrador Inuit Association only at the time of a meeting in Nain between members of the Panel's Secretariat and the LIA...

MS EDMUNDS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: ... to scope the issues of this review.

This Panel is attempting to maintain a certain reasonable schedule of its work. An earlier attempt had been made to hold a meeting with the LIA to discuss issues and the preparation and issuance of the Draft Guidelines document was held back as long as, I believe, was reasonable.

I would like to make the point that the purpose of that meeting in Nain was not really to discuss the Draft Guidelines, because the Draft was as the draft was at that time, and it was not going to be modified before being issued as a Draft.

Edmunds, Sub.

The LIA has, I believe, had quite a lot of time, as has everyone else, to prepare comments on the Draft and I believe that that is the point of the whole exercise.

It is unfortunate that an attempt to hold a scoping meeting earlier with LIA was frustrated by weather conditions but, as we all know, the world is not perfect.

With regard to the hiring of technical experts to assist the Panel, I believe it has been demonstrated quite clearly by certain public statements and announcements that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is a very interested party with regard to this review.

Now, the regional biologist to whom you have referred is an employee of that government. So I find it very difficult to imagine the situation where that person could be hired as an objective and disinterested expert on the subject of caribou in order to assist the Panel.

I think the same reasoning would apply to any other employee of either the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, or the Government of Quebec, all of which goes to say that it would not be proper, I think, to hire that person as a technical expert to assist the Panel.

The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office has hired certain experts, including

Edmunds, Sub.

a person who is a recognized expert on the subject of caribou. The fact that it happens to be a resident of the Province of Quebec, I think, does not really matter all that much.

If the Labrador Inuit Association or anyone else would care to put forward the name of a recognized expert on the subject of caribou who does not happen to be an employee of either of the governments who obviously have an interest in the outcome of this review, we would be glad to accept such suggestions, because the process of hiring experts has not finished by any means. We are still seeking others.

With regard to asking the proponent to comment on the Draft Guidelines, I have discussed such a procedure with officials of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office and I have been given to understand that there has not been any occasion where a Panel has invited the proponent to comment on Draft Guidelines.

I can only take that information as being correct. So it is not, at least at this time, the intent of the Panel to ask for such comments from the proponent.

One more thing to comment on: You complain that there have been no geographic boundaries set for this review.

I think that to do so would be to

Edmunds, Sub.

presuppose what some of the impacts of the project might be and where they might occur. This is probably a good time to point out that it is not this Panel which is going to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement, that the procedure is to request the proponent to do that and in so doing, to determine where, in fact, the impacts may be, geographically-speaking, and to, in doing so, define the geographical scope of the impacts of the project.

This will be an assessment in the first instance by the proponent and it may well be that the geographical boundaries of certain studies done to support the Impact Statement may be different from the geographical boundaries of certain other studies.

As I say, certain effects of the project may be felt in different places than certain other effects. To presuppose what they might be at this time would be highly improper for this Panel.

Now, if there are any other points which you would be asking for an immediate reply which would not take too long, would you indicate that right now and I will do my best to respond to it?

MS EDMUNDS: Not at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS EDMUNDS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes?

MR. KENNY MICHELIN: Kenny Michelin

again.

What I would like to find out, Sharon, is you had a good few comments for the Panel there but I want to know why did you bring it here? Could you not do that in Nain, finish it off?

MS EDMUNDS: Okay. We have spent a lot of time and prepared a very lengthy presentation. We did not think that it would be fair to the Panel or to the community of Nain to present the entire document in Nain. Therefore, since the Panel was visiting three communities along the north coast, that it might be a better idea for us and for their benefit to break the presentation up into three separate parts, thereby giving us a break in the presentation and giving the Panel a break as well.

It would also include a representative from LIA in the communities.

MR. MICHELIN: Because, as I said, we wasted a lot of our precious time.

Do not get me wrong: It is good what you are doing here, but I think we would like to see more input from our community, too.

MS EDMUNDS: Yes.

MR. MICHELIN: You took up some time there.

MS EDMUNDS: I understand what you are saying, and I apologize for taking up the time that the community would like to use.

MR. MICHELIN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Edmunds. Thank you.

Now, as I indicated earlier, we do not have to stop at ten o'clock tonight. We are staying here in Rigolet overnight and we are willing to go on for a reasonable additional period of time because we have come here, as we have gone elsewhere, to hear from the people.

So we welcome comments, statements or questions from anyone.

MR. BILL SHIWAK: I have a couple of short questions here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. SHIWAK: I do not know if I am to ask the Major or you people, but I did hear on the radio that the people opposed to the NATO base in Goose Bay were under military surveillance.

Now, is that true or false, sir? Is it just a rumour? I heard it on the radio today, this morning. That is the first one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major, I think I will pass that one to you to answer or to try to answer.

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, I have not been listening to the radio today, so I cannot comment on that.

Without being facetious, I will say that one of the freedoms of our society is that the media can say an awful lot of things on the radio.

I find that extremely difficult to

comprehend. It is not the military's job to put people under surveillance. If there is anybody involved in that type of thing, that comes under the jurisdiction of the RCMP, not the military.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, I am not quite sure whether this was military, although maybe it is.

Another thing, when the Americans were here, they had checkpoints, of course, for security reasons. You are going to have quite a number of military aircraft in here and you are going to want to protect them.

I am inclined to think there will be checkpoints again, thereby denying anybody without a valid pass to the base the freedom that we have to visit any part of the base, as we do now.

Do you think that is going to happen again?

MAJOR McCABE: Were you absent from the room, sir, earlier, when I specifically addressed that question?

MR. SHIWAK: I must have been.

MAJOR McCABE: I made the statement at that time, there is no intention to set up a gate system that used to exist on the south side of the airfield there.

There is limited access to the airfield right now and it is a civilian airfield. There is no intention to make a massive, tight security base there. There are lots of military planes there now and have been, as I have mentioned before. People can go and take pictures from outside the fence all they want. I do not see any intention to start setting a pass control system up or anything else.

If there is a specific operational area that is built up near the airfield, I would imagine access into that particular facility might be required, as we have at other places in Canada, but there is no intention to start fencing off huge areas which are currently accessible to the public.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes, but how about if an accident occurs whereby you feel this is necessary?

MAJOR McCABE: I do not understand what you are asking.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, maybe sabotage or something, maybe that could happen. Then there certainly would be a tightened up security, would there not?

MAJOR McCABE: The security for the flight line where the aircraft will be, that is the only area that would be of any concern, the flight line area.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes. Well, okay.

How about the hospital now? There is only one hospital in Goose Bay. This hospital looks after most of the coast of Labrador. Is that supposed to look after you, too, or all the influx of military personnel?

I think our health delivery system

is going to deteriorate, if that happens, unless you are going to build a new hospital or something.

MAJOR McCABE: I think you have answered your own question there, sir.

MR. SHIWAK: How?

MAJOR McCABE: You cannot possibly increase a population if the facilities cannot handle it. That is part of the whole detailed planning and design phase that I mentioned would have to take place.

Incidentally, hospital and health care is not a military matter. That is a provincial matter.

MR. SHIWAK: So you are building...

MAJOR McCABE: No, I am not building anything. That is a provincial matter.

MR. SHIWAK: No, the military, I mean, for their own medical needs.

MAJOR McCABE: The military uses a portion of that hospital. We have a few of our own personnel there.

Any of the families of the military use that hopsital under the provincial health plan as do the families of the other allied people who are here.

It is only the military people themselves that have their own plan, if you like.

Now, everyone is very aware of the limitations of that particular facility. I am sure that that, as with many other facilities for the public, will have to be expanded.

MR. SHIWAK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anybody else like to say anything?

MR. MICHELIN: Kenny Michelin again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. MICHELIN: One thing I would like to find out, if we can, is that you have designated flying space for the aircraft.

If NATO do come to Goose Bay, what I would like to know: Would we see here in Rigolet, an individual like me out there, would I see more planes flying around than I usually do? Would I see more aircraft or any other type of equipment?

MAJOR McCABE: I suppose it depends, Mr. Michelin, on your definition of "would you see".

It is very difficult to answer that, particularly with respect to the NATO project, because, as I mentioned earlier, it is a proposal, it is an idea which is in the very early stages of development.

No one has come here and put specific plans on the map of exactly where things would be because that kind of thing requires a great deal of time for planning and study by the experts. We have not had those people here.

So I have seen a rough idea of what they have looked at in a three or four day period they spent in Goose Bay and, as I mentioned earlier, it is basically oriented over top of the existing northern area.

Now, when they come to do the actual set-up of the facility, the design of it, they may find that that area is not suitable for whatever reasons, in which case it would be somewhere else.

So it is difficult for me to give you any kind of a clear response that you would see more aircraft around Rigolet, for example.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, please come ahead.

MR. SHIWAK: I think, as far as I can see and maybe the others, this is purely academic what we are doing here tonight.

The Government of Canada wants that NATO base there, if they can get it. So does the Opposition, all except the NDP. If they can get it there, it is going there.

So what we are saying is, I do not know, this is useless. They are going to put it there anyway, if they can get it at all, if Turkey does not get it.

In any case, they are going to escalate and make deals with Britain and Holland and Germany, as they have now and they are going to escalate that, without getting any air base. They are still going to want low level flying or whatever. That is all cut and dried, right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, sir, I appreciate your opinion.

I would not want to make a comment on that, but I would like to say that a decision on the project is not going to be made for some time to come yet, as you have already heard Major McCabe say.

The Panel hopes that, through receiving the Environmental Impact Statement and through listening to the concerns and interests of people like yourself, that, before that decision point comes, we may be able to contribute something valuable to the process of planning this facility, if it should come to pass.

That, I believe, is the most any Panel could hope to do. This, after all, is a planning process and we hope to contribute to that process.

MR. SHIWAK: The next time around you will be presenting us with a report on what you have already done to that point in time, is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, the Panel will, indeed, be putting out a report of some sort within the next couple of months, indicating our progress up to that point.

You might expect to see that come out somewhere around the end of the year, after we have taken care of issuing the final form of the Guidelines which is our most important task ahead of us right now.

The next important point, from the point of view of the public, would be the appearance of the Environmental Impact Statement and you would be given an opportunity to read that before we would schedule another round of meetings.

But to answer your question, I suppose, there is more information coming, there are more meetings coming and, as long as we continue to receive some indication that there is interest in Rigolet in this project and the outcome of this review, we would certainly plan to include this community in any future round of meetings.

So keep up the interest and you will be certain to see us come back here again.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, we are pretty close to Goose Bay, so it is going to concern us quite a lot, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Well, this is what we want to see, interested people.

MR. SHIWAK: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. SHIWAK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Stewart would like to say something.

MR. DON STEWART: Before Mr. Shiwak leaves, I just would like to make a point. I do not speak on behalf of DND at all.

If we reflect back to that '72-'74 timeframe when I happened to be in Goose Bay, what we were dealing with then was a piece of property that had been essentially leased by the Canadian Government to the U.S. Government. I remember very well the concerns, and it was really an issue at that time.

Inside that boundary security was of concern to the U.S. Government and, specifically, the United States Air Force. It was the spring of 1974 when the barriers were taken down on that piece of property.

The point I really want to make is, at that time, we were dealing with the U.S. Government in that particular area.

At this point in time -- and I have no involvement on the DND side of it whatsoever at this point -- we are now dealing Canadians with Canadians. I am not pointing the finger at the Americans during that period; they were doing what they thought best on a piece of property that we had given to them.

In large measure, we had very little control as Canadians as to what went on inside that well-defined area.

MR. SHIWAK: Yes. I know all about that checkpoint. When it came down, the Canadians put up a sign, «Welcome to Canada» and the Yanks went out and tore it down in the night some time.

Anyway, there are other nationals besides Canadians going to be there. Of course, the are going to want security for their aircraft.

If they request something, what happens then?

MR. DON STEWART: Yes, I have nothing to do with what DND might do in the way of security. That is something that I defer to the Major and the Department.

Also, the security that the Americans had on that piece of property was done in the first instance at the checkpoints, which was a very great concern, as I remember.

In the interval, since 1974 to the present day, the airport aprons and the airport, per se, been fenced by the Minstry of Transport. DPW and the security, whatever level you would wish to call it, has been moved inside the domestic area, up to the hangar line, and the airport terminal, hangars and those areas.

So it is quite a different situation than what prevailed in 1974.

MR. SHIWAK: Well, at that time, I worked with the Americans and you had to have a general pass to get on the base. Then, to work in restricted areas, you had to have a restricted area pass.

In fact, when you went down to the ammunition dump and places like that, they would take your pass from you and they would have a guard with you, following you around all day long, if you were working there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Since there does not appear to be anyone else who wishes to say anything further, I believe it is time to close the meeting.

I am sorry that some of the people in the audience found it necessary to leave already because, on behalf of the Panel, I wanted to express our sincere thanks to everyone who has come here tonight, particularly those people who have come forward and spoken to us.

The people have welcomed us to this community and, more important than that, because of the need for us to stay over two nights here, you have welcomed us into your homes and we sincerely appreciate that.

Our thanks, in particular, also to the ladies who spent so much time preparing an excellent meal for the Panel here tonight.

So, in closing, then, I would thank also the members of the Secretariat, to our reporter, to our audio technician and to our interpreters.

As I said, keep up the interest and we will be back. Thank you all again very much.

Good night.

---Upon adjourning at 10:15 p.m.

Volume

17

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	MAKKOVIK	ENDROIT
DATE	October/octobre 31, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	17	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: John Christian Erhardt School, Makkovik

DATE: October/octobre 31, 1986.

VOLUME: 17

INDEX

AFTERNOON SESSION: PAGE

Introduction by The Chairman 1873
Presentation by Major David McCabe 1896

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Jonathan Robinson 1893
Enid McNeill 1910
Johnathan Robinson 1912
Abe Flowers 1916
Morris Jacque 1919
Jonathan Robinson 1921
Pam Breshnahan 1923
Jonathan Robinson 1928
Ruth Flowers 1947
Enid McNeill 1949

* * * * *

EVENING SESSION:

Introduction by The Chairman 1954
Toby Andersen 1964
Presentation by Major David McCabe 1966
Gary Mitchell 1980
Toby Andersen 1981
Toby Andersen 1988
Gary Mitchell 1998
William Andersen, Senior 2011
Janet Pilgrim 2014
Peggy Edmunds 2016
Morris Jacque 2017
Ted Andersen 2019
Violet Ford 2032
Rupert McNeill, Junior 2035
Merv Andersen 2038
Sharon Edmunds 2044

---Upon commencing at 2:00 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon everybody.

My name is David Barnes. I work for the Government of Canada, and I am Chairman for this group of people, this Environmental Assessment Panel.

We have come to Makkovik today to sit here and talk with you about a proposal for a certain project to be undertaken at Goose Bay. It is a military project involving low level flight training and possibly involving expansion of Goose Bay airfield.

I am glad to see so many people here. I understand that a lot of you are students from school, and I have already had an opportunity to say a few words to you.

I am also glad to see so many other people here from Makkovik, and I understand there are some people here from Postville as well.

Before we go on, there are two things I would like to mention. One is that we are providing simultaneous interpretation from English to Inuktituk and, when the situation arises, from Inuktituk to English. If anyone would like to listen to everything that is going on in Inuktituk, you have only to obtain a headset and a receiver over at the side of the room. The other things I wish to draw to your attention is the sign over the door which asks us not to smoke in here.

I hope you have already gathered that

23A-2

our setting here today is informal. This is not supposed to be a hearing. It is not a court case or anything like that. We want you to feel comfortable. I think we feel pretty comfortable up here. We have to use this kind of set up with the tables and the microphones and all this sort of thing because we have to have a precise record of everything that was said at this meeting.

The lady over there in the corner at the desk, Mrs. Thomson, is making a recording and taking notes about everything that is going on here, and in a few weeks time we will receive from her company what we call a "transcript" of the meeting. That written transcript will be available to anybody who wishes to have a copy, and that goes for the transcripts of all the other meetings that we have been holding over the past two months.

As I said, please be comfortable. Do not be bashful about coming forward and speaking to us when the time comes, because we have come a long distance to talk with you and to hear from you. I guess most of us are a little bit hesitant about getting up before a group, but there is really no reason to be so here.

What we are going to do here this afternoon is, first of all, tell you something about why we are here, what this process is, what this review is all about, how it is supposed to work, how you people and all of the other communities that may feel some effects from this project have an opportunity to participate in the review. I will also say something about the time schedule of the review.

After that we will hear a brief description of the project itself: What is being proposed, and what is going on now, as a matter of fact.

Then we will have a short break in the meeting, after which we will begin again and hear from all of the people who have indicated to us that they want to speak to us while we are here, in Makkovik. At the present time I have a list of eight speakers, some of whom want to speak this afternoon, and some tonight.

At certain points I will invite you to ask questions about the process, or about the project and please feel free to ask your questions.

The first thing I would like to do to begin the meeting is to introduce the other members of the Panel to you. This Panel has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment to carry on this public review. The people on the Panel have been chosen because they have a certain knowledge, certain background, certain particular expertise that is related to the subjects and the issues that are going to be the most important ones to be discussed in this review.

Beginning at your left, at the end of the table from that way, and first is the row, is

Mr. Don Stewart. Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canarian Armed Forces. His last position in the Forces was as Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions, and he was posted at Goose Bay for several years. He knows a great deal about Goose Bay airfield and the surrounding area and how that operation has worked in the past. He knows a great deal about military aircraft and how they operate and how they are deployed and all that sort of thing. That is the reason why he has been appointed as one of the members of this Panel. Mr. Stewart lives near Ottawa, where he operates a small farm.

Next to him is Mr. Tom Northcott. Mr. Northcott lives in St. John's. He is a biologist who has had extensive experience with wildlife in Newfoundland and Labrador. He was, at one time, employed with the Wildlife Division of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and at the present time he is Vice President of a consulting firm called Northland Associates Limited.

I would imagine that most of you here know the next gentleman. He is, of course, Mr. Tim McNeill, and I am not going to give the usual introduction for him because I am sure there is no need to. I am sure everybody in Makkovik, and everyone here from Postville must know who Mr. McNeill is. He has been appointed to the Panel because we believe that he has valuable knowledge about the culture and societal interests and the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

On my left is Mr. William Jourdain. Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec. He has been very active there in the affairs of the Montagnais Indian Band, and has also been involved in certain commercial interests in the town. Before his retirement, Mr. Jourdain was employed with the Iron Ore Company of Canada for about 25 years.

Finally, at the other end of the table, is Dr. Paul Wilkinson. Dr. Wilkinson is also a biologist. He works extensively with the Naskapi Indian people of northern Quebec. He was involved in the negotiation of an agreement called the North-eastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis, and is still involved in the implementation of that agreement. Dr. Wilkinson lives in Montreal where he also operates a consulting firm.

I was born in St. John's, and until about one year ago, for the 11 years or so up to that point, I was employed with the Newfoundland government in the Environment Department. Since September of last year, I have been working at the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, an agency of the Government of Canada, located in Hull, Quebec, just across the river from Ottawa. And, when I am not functioning as the Chairman of the Panel, I am the Director for the Atlantic Region of that office.

Now that you know the members of the Panel a little better, I want to briefly outline the process of this review that we are going through.

In 1973, the Government of Canada, following on the lead of certain other countries in the world, decided to build environmental planning into the overall planning process for major projects for which the Government of Canada is responsible. It did this by setting up a process known as the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, known for short as E-A-R-P, or EARP.

Under that process, projects being proposed by any department of the Government of Canada have to be examined to determine what their environmental and social and economic effects may be before the government makes a final decision on whether or not that project is to go ahead.

The process works as, what we call, a self assessment process. That means that the responsibility in the first place rests with the department responsible for the project to examine that project to determine what its environmental effects are likely to be, and what measures need to be taken to deal with those effects, some of which may be beneficial, some of which may be harmful.

The first step of the process involves an internal examination of the proposed project by the department proposing it. If that department finds that the project is likely to cause significant environmental effects, or is likely to raise serious concerns in the mind of the public, that department must refer the proposal to the Minister of the Environment, and ask that minister to begin a publc environmental review like the one that is going on now for this project.

So it happened then that in February of 1986, the Department of National Defence wrote a letter to the Minister of the Environment describing this project, and asking the Minister to conduct a public review. After the usual process of seeking out suitable candidates for the Panel, the Minister appointed this Panel in July, and gave it a certain mandate in a document which we call the Terms of Reference. That document, like all the other documents in this review, is a public document. It is available to anybody who would like to have a copy.

The Panel sat down and looked at a lot of background information which had been collected for it, and tried to think of what the issues are likely to be in this review; what are the concerns that need to be addressed. It did that because the review will be carried out by the Panel requiring the Department of National Defence to prepare and submit to the Panel a major report called an Environmental Impact Statement. That will be a statement by National Defence as the proponent of this project of what its project is proposed to be, of what the environmental and social and economic side effects are likely to be, and will also include a commitment by National Defence to take certain measures to enhance

23A-8

beneficial impacts, or to minimize or eliminate harmful impacts.

Along with that there may be a responsibility by other agencies, such as certain departments of government, to take measures to offset impacts as well.

That Environmental Impact Statement will be submitted to the Panel, and will undergo a period of review.

In order to make sure that the Impact Statement contains all the right subjects, covers all the issues that need to be covered, the Panel must give to National Defence a set of instructions on how to go about writing that Impact Statement. Those instructions are going to be contained in a document called the Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

After a preliminary look at the project and the important issues, the Panel published a draft, a preliminary version of the Guidelines document in August of this year. That Guidelines document was distributed to everyone on our mailing list, and to various other parties as well. More copies are still available if you would care to obtain one.

The idea of doing this is to let all of the other interested parties in the review look at the draft, and to tell the Panel whether it has covered all the right subjects in the right way, or whether the Guidelines document needs to be improved.

.3A-9 After publishing the document and having it out in the public for a period of time, the Panel began this series of public meetings which has come to an end this week.

We have 17 communities on our list, and we have been on the road off-and-on through much of September and October, and in each community we have been asking people who have had an opportunity to read the Guidelines to tell us how they feel about them. Have we done and said everything right, or is there room for improvement? And we certainly have been getting a wide variety of comments on the Guidelines.

In addition to that, people who have not had time to look at the Guidelines, who have not had an opportunity or perhaps have had some difficulty in understanding the document for one reason or another, have been nevertheless talking to us anyway about how they feel about the project; what worries or concerns may be in their minds about the possible effects of the project. We have always made time for that sort of presentation to the Panel too. Even though the comments may not be specific ones on a particular section of the Draft Guidelines, the information presented will most likely be useful to the Panel in deciding what parts of the Guidelines needs to be changed, to be improved. Even though you may not have seen those Guidelines, do not let that stop you from getting up and speaking to the Panel here today.

23. _0

After these meetings are all over, the Panel will meet, it will go over all the information that has come to it during the meetings, and will prepare the final form of the Guidelines. Our plan is to be able to present those Guidelines to National Defence some time in December of this year. The Guidelines will be published, and will be available in English and French and several Native languages.

When National Defence receives the Guidelines, it will begin the process of preparing its Environmental Impact Statement. That will involve a great deal of work in gathering together information that already exists on a variety of sources, and also going out and doing some new studies that may be necessary to produce information that is needed, but does not already exist. This will take a period of many months.

Indications at the present time are that National Defence may be in a position to submit the Environmental Impact Statement to this Panel some time in 1987, perhaps in the early summer.

The Impact Statement will be made public as soon as the Panel receives it, so that over the months that follow, the Panel and the public will both have an opportunity to examine the document, and to decide whether it meets the Guidelines or not.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that it has met all the requirements set out in the Guidelines, the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings. They will be, in many ways, similar to this meeting that is going on here today. For various reasons, they may have to be a little more formal than this meeting, but will still be designed to meet with the people in a comfortable setting so that people will feel free to get up and speak their mind about the project and about the Environmental Impact Statement.

When the hearings are over, and it is likely that the hearings will probably be held in the fall of 1987 if everything goes according to the tentative plan before us right now. Then the Panel will sit down and write its own report to the Government of Canada saying we have examined this project, we have decided that the likely environmental impacts of the project are such-and-such-and-such, that we feel that certain measures are available to deal with some or all of these impacts. Also in that report the Panel will make recommendations to the government as to whether or not the project is acceptable from an environmental point of view.

The decision on whether the project will actually go ahead, rests in the hands of the government, not in the hands of this Panel. That is important for everyone to understand. The Panel had a mandate to study and to recommend, but not to make decisions on whether or not the project goes ahead.

I would like to say a few words about the Guidelines in particular.

One more thing about the schedule: The Panel feels that it will probably be in a position to submit its report to the government perhaps late in 1987, or early in 1988.

Looking at the Guidelines for a few minutes, this document will set out the instructions for National Defence to write the Environmental Impact Statement. It begins with a number of definitions of terms which may be a little strange to a lot of people who have not previously been involved in an environmental assessment exercise. It goes on through a general introductory section and then talks about the scope of the project. It is pointed out at the very beginning that these Guidelines, and therefore the assessment, apply to the entire project; not only the low level flying that you may have heard about, but also all activities that may be associated with construction or operation and maintenance of the Goose Bay airfield, and following right through to the possibly close-down of the training centre if it should be approved.

There are two components to this project that are going to be examined separately, as far as possible, although there may be some overlap between the two.

The first part, or component, is the existing low level flight training exercises that are going, or at least have been going on this year up until very recently, and which have been going on for several years. These are being conducted at the present time by two of Canada's NATO allies, Britain and West Germany. But as part of this first component of the project there is a proposal that the amount of low level flight training of this sort may increase in the future, perhaps by either of these two countries increasing the amount of training they are doing, or by the addition of one or two or more of the other NATO allies. For example, the Netherlands appears to be interested, and we will hear more about this later.

The other component of the project is a proposal to establish and operate a training centre for NATO, based at Goose Bay. The full name for this would be the Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre and would include the establishment and operation of weapons and training ranges, and all of the activities and facilities and installations that would be associated with it.

The next section of the Guidelines talks about methods to be used in gathering information, methods to be used in carrying out new studies which may be needed and methods to be used in writing the Environmental Impact Statement.

The following section lists some issues which the Panel has written down, because it felt that the assessment should at least look at these issues. The Panel, up to August when the Guidelines were published, had identified nine issues which appeared to the Panel to be important. I am going to read each of these to you so you will have an idea of what the Panel's thinking was at that time. I say at that time because all through the course of these meetings we have been hearing a lot about what people's concerns are, and we may decide after looking over all of this information that more and more of these issues need to be stated in a slightly different way, or perhaps other issues need to be added to the list.

Issue number one is the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and also on wildlife.

Number two, the effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use.

Issue number three, the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, and in other communities in the project area.

Number four, the impacts of the project on commercial activities with their base on renewable resources. For example, the operation of outfitting camps for sport hunters who go after caribou or other animals.

Number five talks about the natural environment, and highlights of the issue of the impacts on that natural environment of construction activities associated with possible expansion of Goose Bay airport, and also the effects on the natural environment of exhause emissions from aircraft resulting from increased flying activities.

3A-15

Issue number six is the cumulative or combined or additive effects of the project under review, and of other projects and activities that may be going on in the region.

Number seven is the possible need to monitor this project if it continues and goes ahead; to watch over the project in a methodical, in a scientific manner perhaps, during the construction phase, during the operational phase, and following right through to the possible close-down of the project. And I will say a little more about monitoring in a few minutes.

Issue number eight, the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges.

Issue number nine, the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning native land claims. Just a word of explanation on this point: Anybody who has had an opportunity to look at the Panel's mandate will see in there that the policy of the Government of Canada concerning how it deals with Native people with regard to land claims is not, in itself, a subject to be examined by this Panel. That is the policy. However, accepting that policy for what it is, the Panel feels that the project may indeed be found to have some effect on the outcome of the negotiations with Native people based on that policy, so that it has been entered here as one of the issues to be examined.

The next section of the Guidelines sets

-3A-16

out what might be regarded as a table of contents for the Impact Statement. It is a list of the subjects, in order, that the Panel feels must be included in that Impact Statement.

At the beginning, as you might expect, there would be a summary. That summary would bring together the important findings of the Impact Statement, and would be written in such a way that the readers would be able to focus immediately on the major projected impacts of the project on any areas of uncertainty where it has not been possible to predict impacts, for example, and other very important matters. That summary would be part of the main Impact Statement itself. It would also be published separately, because we feel that some people may not have the need or the inclination to read the entire Impact Statement which may be a very lengthy document, and may wish to read only the summary to get a quick appreciation for what is in there.

That summary will be published in English and in French, and in certain languages and dialects to meet the needs of the Native groups that have been identified which may somehow feel impacts from this project.

Another very important section of the Impact Statement will have to set out the justification for the project. In order to examine the project and to examine its impact, it is important for both the Panel and the public to understand why the project is

23A-17

being proposed.

The proponent, in its Impact Statement, will also have to talk about other projects that may be going on now in the area, or may be proposed for the near future, that could act in conjunction with the project under review to cause additive or cumulative impacts. So information on other existing or planned or probable developments within any of the areas that can be affected by the project will have to be presented. Examples of such projects which may be known to you are the North Warning Radar System, the commercial caribou hunts near Nain and also near Kuujjuaq in Quebec, possible hydro-electric developments at Gull Island or Muskrat Falls and the Trans-Labrador Highway.

The Impact Statement will also have to talk about alternatives. There will obviously be a preferred way of carrying out this project in the minds of National Defence. In reaching that preferred alternative, National Defence will also have examined a great many other possible ways of achieving the same objective, and will have to discuss those alternatives in the Impact Statement. For example, they would have to discuss alternative sites for runways and for other airport infrastructure, alternative flying areas to the ones that have already been proposed and perhaps the use of flight simulators as a method of flight training in addition to the actual low level flying exercises.

It may seem obvious to mention this but of course we will have to have a description of the project itself. There is a description of the project now, a rather brief one, which is part of the document that was referred to the Minister of the Environment last February. The Panel has looked at that description, and it has identified a need for further information. Some of that information needs to be provided very soon. So, the Panel has written to National Defence asking for that additional information. Some of it is being provided in these meetings. Some will be provided in writing in the near future.

In order to understand what the environmental side-effects of the project may be, we need to have an understanding of what the environment is at the present time. Therefore, the proponent will be asked to provide in the Impact Statement a description of the existing environment, particularly related to the issues that we have identified already, and to other issues which may be identified.

That description of the existing environment will have to discuss not only the natural environment, the land, the water, the wildlife, all that sort of thing, but also the existing human environment of the people who life here. What is their cultural background? What is their social structure at the present time? How is it evolving? How do these people obtain their food? How do they earn their living. All of this needs to be understood so we can see what effect the project may have on all of this.

Having described the project, and having described the existing environment, the Impact Statement will then predict, from the point of view of the proponent of course, what the environmental side-effects are likely to be, what the impacts are likely to be.

Where there are likely to be impacts, it will be necessary to propose way of dealing with them. Are there any benefits to be gained from the project? It is important to look at how those benefits could be increased, maximized. Where there are going to be undesirable or harmful impacts, it is important to see ways and means of minimizing or eliminating such impacts. It will be the responsibility of the proponent in its Impact Statement to talk about these measures which we call mitigative measures, and to identify who would be responsible for carrying them out, and to predict how effective those measures might be.

There may be impacts for which it is not possible to design any mitigative measure, or there may be impacts for which the mitigative measures may only work part way. In either case, what you would have left would be what they call residual impacts which would have to be accepted if the government were to approve the project. It will be very important for

23A-20

everyone to understand just what those residual impacts would be, and how serious they would be. So there will be a section in the Impact Statement on residual impacts.

Next we will come to the section on monitoring, which I mentioned before. Here the proponent will be expected to propose a system of monitoring, perhaps during construction, operation, etc. The proponent would have to describe this monitoring program, would have to estimate the cost of carrying on such a program, and again would have to identify the parties which would be responsible for the various parts of that monitoring program. Some of the monitoring might be the responsibility of National Defence itself. Some might be the responsibility of certain department of the government, perhaps the federal government, perhaps one of the two provincial governments that are involved.

There would be three purposes for this monitoring. One would be to test the validity and the accuracy of the impacts which had been predicted in advance in the Impact Statement. The second one would be to detect, to identify and to evaluate impacts which might turn up during the course of construction or operation which had not been predicted ahead of time. The third purpose would be to test how effective the mitigative measures were in enhancing the beneficial impacts or offsetting the harmful impacts.

That then gives you an outline of what the Guidelines document will contain.

This might be a good place to stop and ask for questions on what I have just talked about; the process, the review and that sort of thing.

Would anyone who wants to ask a question please use the microphone in the middle of the floor. I would ask each speaker to state his name before asking the question.

Go ahead, sir.

MR. JONATHAN ROBINSON: My name is Jonathan Robinson.

I wanted to know, when you are making your final recommendation to the Government of Canada, can you tell us what department that would be, or how that recommendation would work its way through at the federal government level?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I usually mention that. It slipped my mind this time.

The report of this Panel would go to two ministers, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of National Defence as the minister of the proponent department. When they receive that report, it is the responsibility of those ministers to first of all have the report made public, and then to ensure that there is a response to the Panel's report prepared and also made public indicating how the government intended to response to what was contained in the Panel's report. Does that answer your question?

Would anyone else have a question?

MR. ROBINSON: I also wanted to know if you have any assurances, as a Panel, that these departments, the Ministers of National Defence and the Environment, will wait until your Panel is finished before it makes a decision on any military expansion?

THE CHAIRMAN: You will hear a bit about this later on anyway, but for now just to indicate briefly how this relates with the decision-making process on this project, I have indicated that the Panel would hope to make its report no later than the early part of 1988. With regard to the project itself, I am talking now about the proposed NATO Flight Training Centre, NATO will be making a decision about the end of this year, 1986, on whether it wishes to locate the training centre in Canada or in the country of Turkey. If we assume, for the sake of argument at the moment, that NATO choses Canada, that will begin a period of discussion, as I understand it, over about two years during which Canada would negotiate with NATO on exactly what the training centre would include, what the financial and other arrangements would be between Canada and NATO, and of course Canada would be looking to maximize the benefits that would come to Canada from having the centre located at Goose Bay.

At the end of that period, perhaps at

.S-13B-1
ET:ET

the end of 1988, Canada would decide finally whether or not it wanted to accept the offer of having this base at Goose Bay. Therefore, by the time Canada reaches that decision point, it is intended to have the report of this Panel completed and submitted and in the hands of government, well in advance of that point.

It is our understanding that the report of this Panel will feed into that planning and negotiation process, and will form a large part of the information that the Government of Canada would need in reaching that decision.

That, I believe, would indicate to you how this is all supposed to work.

If there are no other questions at the moment, we will have a short break now. I have been reminded that our interpreter may be getting a little worn out at this point, and we would like to give him a break. So we will break for 10 minutes, and come back afterwards. Thank you very much.

---Short recess.

---Upon resuming at 3:20 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, whenever the Panel goes out to meet the public, as we are doing here, we wish to make sure that everyone understands just what the project is that is undergoing review.

There have been various bits and pieces of information available and around during this project,

3B-2

some of which appears to be accurate, but then, on the other hand, some of which appears to be not totally accurate. So, in order to provide you with good, accurate information on the nature of the proposal, it is always our practice to invite to these meetings a representative of the proponent, the Department of National Defence.

I would like to introduce to you at this time Major David McCabe, who will give you a brief description of the project, and who will also be pleased to answer any questions you may have about the project.

If you are ready, Major, would you please go ahead.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Mr. Chairman and Panel members, ladies and gentlemen of Makkovik, I am going to give a very brief background to past and current happenings at Goose Bay, and then I will talk about the two proposals that the Chairman has referred to.

Very briefly, I am from National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa. I am the Project Officer for the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre, which you heard about earlier.

I also work on all military plans to do with Goose Bay.

The Goose Bay airport was constructed in 1941 as a staging base for aircraft that were being ferried over to Europe in support of the Second World

B-3

War. After the war, as probably some of you may know that have been into the history, the military presence went up and down over the years. In the peak years of the sixties, there were nearly 12,000 military personnel and their families living in Goose Bay.

Today there are four countries, or four military forces, represented in Goose Bay. These four countries, in February of this year, signed a multinational Memorandum of Understanding which runs for ten years, and governs all military activities in Goose Bay. The four countries are Canada, the United States, Great Britain and West Germany.

I will talk very briefly about what these countries do, because despite the fact there are four militaries, they really do quite different things there.

First of all, the United States Air Force, which really used to be by far the largest military in the previous days, now has a very small detachment of about 16 people. Their primary role is to service the very large transport aircraft that are going to and from Europe. Basically they look after refuelling these aircraft.

The Canadian Forces has several responsibilities there. They man and operate the long range radar, which is part of the early warning system which stretches across northern Canada. We also have Canadian Forces personnel in the air traffic control radar on the field, and since March of this year, the

13B-4

Canadian Forces have established a station rescue flight which has three rescue helicopters. In the summertime, in the past, we used to have a rescue helicopter or two just during the flying season. Now these three helicopters are there year round, on a permanent basis. As well, the Canadian Forces also man the Military Coordination Centre. This Coordination Centre was established in 1984 to better coordinate the military flying activity that was going on at the time. The people they are primarily looking after there are the countries of Germany and Britain. The air forces of these two countries do low level training exercises, and they have been working mostly on that since about 1979 or 1980. They train, using fighter-type aircraft, quite small, in two areas over Labrador and Quebec, and I have those marked on one of the maps on the wall, outlined in red. Within those areas they go down as low as 100 feet above the ground. They can fly outside those areas as well, but they have to stay at a higher altitude.

Every time an aircraft, or a number of aircraft go out to fly they must file a flight plan showing their route with the Military Coordination Centre. At the time they are there, the Canadian Forces personnel advise the pilots of any local restrictions that might be in effect that day. By local restrictions I mean things like the location of large concentrations of caribou or any known locations of occupied hunting or fishing camps. These areas where the camps are located are marked with a circle on their map, about five miles in diameter, and those areas are to be avoided by the low level aircraft.

I should briefly mention that in 1980, which is when the Germans really started flying -- the British had been around for a while -- because of the proposed increases in activity at that time, it was necessary to conduct what is called an initial environmental evaluation, which is a much smaller scale of the kind of thing we are doing right now. In fact, all it consisted of was a desk study, done within the Department of National Defence, of existing material from other parts of the country, other parts of the world. These were studies that had been done which related to the kind of activity that was being proposed at Goose Bay.

Based on an examination of that material, it was felt that any detrimental effects which might come out of this proposed training would be negligible. One area they were not too sure about, because of a lack of study material, dealt with the effects on caribou and the fighter-type aircraft. The studies had been done with helicopters and the light civilian airplanes, but the jets were a little different.

What they recommended at the time was to establish a policy of avoidance of the animals, whenever possible. That is one of the reasons, if you notice, on the northern training area .-- if you get a chance to look at the map you will see that it is subdivided into three parts — the two smaller parts are set up that way because during the period of migration, or during the calving period of the George River herd, which is the largest herd that affects the area, those areas can be closed off to military flying.

I might add that those areas that are on that map are not restricted to civilians. People can fly in there, and they can go in at their own free will.

The kind of activity that the Germans and the British do while they are here, and it is usually from about March to the middle of October each year, is to train the aircrew in how to fly their aircraft at low altitudes. The primary reason why they practice this is that it is one of the few techniques which we can use to try and avoid detection by radar.

These air forces come from western Europe, which is very, very densely populated, and it is difficult for them to achieve any beneficial training over there. There are some training areas and ranges, but they are very small and because of the large number of military planes, it is very difficult to get time on these ranges.

Of the two proposals we have spoken about, one is that the current users wish to expand their activity somewhat over the next few years, and that would mean possibly lengthening the flying season and also increasing the number of personnel and the number of aircraft. For example, the British only have nine Tornado aircraft right now, and they would like to increase that.

As well, there have been expressions of interest from other countries in conducting a similar kind of training. Some of you may have heard, and in fact as the Chairman mentioned, that Canada is currently negotiating with the Netherlands government to establish a long-term training plan at Goose Bay. It is hoped, if these negotiations proceed as planned, that the Royal Netherlands Air Force will conduct a half-season training program next, starting probably in June or July, with about 10 to 12 F-16 aircraft.

There might also be, as well as the addition of the country and a few more aircraft, a little more flying done at night, and also in poor weather. Those two activities are done to train the aircrew in how to use the terrain following radar equipment, as it is called, which is in the Tornado aircraft. It is basically a system that allows the aircraft to fly very low in an automatic mode, that is a hands off mode. They have to train their people in how to do that.

One last thing I should mention about the current activity is that from time to time on these low level missions, some of the aircrew will, during the mission, do a practice weapons delivery. We have a practice weapons range located in the southern training area -- I have it marked on the map also -- which is located about 65 miles from Goose Bay. It is about eight miles in diameter, or 13 kilmetres. It is basically a circular shape and located in a sandy, open, flat area that has been previously burned out by a forest fire. There are signed printed in four languages all the way around this location.

By practice weapons I mean that we use a device which is non-explosive and non-contaminant. It is basically made of metal, or sometimes concrete or plastic, and weighted.

The other proposal which we have already referred to by name, and in fact probably has been mentioned a lot on the news, is the NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre. That is a fancy name for an advanced flying school for military pilots, at which they would be able to conduct a wide variety of training activities. I will talk more about those in a minute.

One of the important things to remember with this particular proposal, and I will emphasize it again at the end, it is that it is an idea. The one thing we are talking about and looking at is an expansion of a current operation. It is there, in reality. The NATO project is something that has been discussed and examined over the past five or six years. They have come up with a hypothetical model, an ideal facility,if you like,which could cater to all the training requirements of all the NATO air forces. What we have, in effect, is a very large-scale facility.

One of the reasons it is very large is because at the time they designed it, at the time they studies the requirements, they were told that cost was not to be a constraint. So, they basically had a free rein in what they wanted to design.

I have already alluded to why they needed this centre. And that is because of the lack of space available in Europe. To give an example, over West Germany alone, last year over 538,000 military flights were flown, 110,000 of those were low level, and that was day and night. In that country there are 63 million people living. You can understand that there is a bit of concern with the flying activity rate.

We have heard that two countries are in competition for this centre. One is, of course, Canada which is offering Goose Bay, and the country of Turkey has offered Konya Air Base.

The NATO-appointed working group that has been working on this study, examined both locations last year, wrote up evaluation reports on the two sites, and they have made a recommendation already to NATO. This recommendation will be examined by various levels of NATO, and by December of this year

13B-10

this will make a decision on which they think is the most suitable site. At that point, they will contact the host country and they will begin a serious of negotiations, as the Chairman has already mentioned, and they will get into very detailed planning and design. As I mentioned, they do not have a specific plan of this all set out for Goose Bay, it is a very general idea. Therefore, they would have to sit down with the experts and plan everything out. One of the things that would definitely come into play would be the kind of information that would come out of the environmental studies that are on-going, and are about to be done with this FEARO process.

Under the milestones they have laid down they hope to have a formal agreement signed with the host country by December of 1988, barring any major delays. As well, they are hoping to have the centre operational by the early 1990s.

Should the group that is doing the negotiating and the planning over the next two years run into any kind of insurmountable problem, then they would revert to the alternate site, because both sites have been accepted as being suitable.

A little bit now about the size of this thing. Again, I must say we are talking about an ideal full-scope facility. They are talking about a training period of about 40 weeks of the year, and that would consist of 20 two-week detachments of about 136 aircraft which would fly up to 200 flights a day. There would be, every two weeks, approximately 1,500 people transiting through Goose Bay, coming in to train. Those people would be supported at the airfield by a resident staff of about 1,700 multinational people. They, because they would likely be there for two or three years, would likely bring their families, further increasing the population by 1,000 or 1,500 or so.

In the initial establishment of this centre, there would be a great deal of construction required. Things like quarters, married housing, recreational facilities, hangars, operations centres. There would also be an expansion of the existing facilities at the airfield, such as a parallel runway being constructed, upgrading or rehabilitation of the existing fuel storage and distribution system. As well, a regular resupply system would have to be established for the operation. That might mean an extension of the current shipping season, or possibly an expansion or improvement of the Trans-Labrador Highway system, which is under construction at the present time.

The types of activities that would go on at the NATO Training Centre -- and again we must refer to the document that has been the over all plan of this -- some of these activities are desirable only. Some examples of these are the low level navigation and reconnaissance training that is currently done, there would be some of that. Air combat training at

13B-12

medium to high altitudes, electronic warfare training, and that basically is using electronic equipment on the aircraft and also equipment on the ground. There would be a requirement for both practice weapons delivery on a maximum of four ranges similar to the type we have right now, and also there has been stated a requirement for up to three live weapons ranges.

As well, there would be -- and this is one of the desirable only items -- a sea range. The proper term for this would be a tactical air support of maritime operations, which is really anti-shipping. This would be an area somewhere at sea where, from time to time, aircraft could practice manoeuvres against military shipping. As well, from time to time, these aircraft might fire at a target which was towed by the ships. Although this would be something new for the areas up here, it is certainly not new for Canada. There are ranges where this kind of activity is done off the coasts of Canada and the United States.

Another desirable type of activity, and again this might possibly not be able to be established if there are too many restrictions or constraints, would be an air-to-air gunnery range. This kind of activity usually has to be done over sterile or unpopulated land. In this case, it may well have to be established over the ocean, if it is established at all. Again, the results of the studies and other

-13 things would dictate whether we would be able to set up something like that.

One thing that has changed since the initial description or defining of this facility, is the live weapons range requirement. Now technology has advanced to the stage that nowadays there exists a computerized system which enables an aircraft to carry out a normal mission against realistic targets on the ground, and from which he can get accurate scoring, but nothing comes off the airplane. That is, no weapons are dropped at all.

This system, which is called a no-drop bomb scoring system, has obvious advantages. For example, the protection of the environment, because nothing is in contact with the ground. As well, there are significant cost savings by saving on weapons.

Should there still be a requirement for a live weapons range, then there are very stringent criteria for establishing such a range. I might say that these areas do exist in Canada, and they are very closely monitored and cleaned up on a regular basis, to make sure there are no unexploded weapons left there.

Turning now to the socio-economic benefits which might accrue to an area which hosts this kind of facility, I must say this, and we are talking primarily revenues coming into the local area or employment opportunities, etc., this is directly proportional to the size or scope of the facility that is established there. The Department of National Defence is just completing a study based on an accepted model which is examining both the proposed expansion of the current activity, and the full scope of the NATO Centre. They are getting an idea of the types of jobs, numbers of jobs, amounts of revenue, etc., that could be expected to come out of this kind of operation.

The big thing to emphasize here is that they are studying the full scale scenario, so the statistics that come out of that are highly speculative. For example, if the NATO Centre is built at a much smaller scale, then obviously the socio-economic benefits would be proportionately smaller.

There would be two phases for employment opportunities. One would be during the initial construction phase; I have already mentioned the types of facilities that will have to be constructed. The other would be during the regular day-to-day operational phase, just the normal operation of the airport.

During the site survey last year the NATO working team, while it was in Goose Bay, had a brief look at possible options for alternate airfields. Alternate airfields are required when flying activities take place for aircraft to go to if they have an emergency, or if the weather gets bad at their home base. As well, an alternate airfield can be used as a forward base to launch a small number of aircraft in an adversary role for the training.

1. 5

They looked, at the time, at the Towns of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Schefferville. The main reason they examined those is that the working group has been basically orienting their proposed location of the centre over the existing northern training area, so those airfields would be logical choices.

If those are chosen they would require some modest construction and upgrading. For example, lengthening the runway, upgrading a refuelling system and possibly constructing some accommodations.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlement, I again want to emphasize that the expansion proposals that are being studied over the next two years with this procedure and also that I have been talking about, are very much based on the assumption that a full scale facility will be constructed.

As I am sure you are all aware, all nations today are undergoing economic cut-backs, belt-tightening exercises. Military programs that I have described are certainly not exempt from this kind of cut back.

As the detailed planning and design phase occurs over the next two years, we will get a much clearer idea of what exactly is in store for Goose Bay as far as military activity for the future. Part of that planning will also be the identification of funding sources.

That is about all I really have to say

13B-16

in trying to keep it short. I thank you for your attention. I am certainly more than happy to take any questions pertaining to what I have been talking about, any clarification of things, or any other questions that might come to mind that you think I might be able to help you out with.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

We would ordinarily entertain questions immediately, however if the Major is agreement, I would like you to hold those questions for a moment because one of our scheduled speakers has indicated that she would prefer to speak to us between three and four o'clock this afternoon. Since it is nearly ten minutes to four, I would like to give her the opportunity to speak to us immediately.

If Mrs. Pam Bresnahan is ready now?

MRS. PAM BRESNAHAN: I could wait ...

THE CHAIRMAN: You are willing to wait for perhaps five or ten minutes?

MRS. BRESNAHAN: Yes, I am.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, thank you very much. All right then, in that case would you please fire your questions at the Major.

We would ask each person to give his or her name at the beginning please.

MS ENID McNEILL: I would like to ask how many civilian jobs have already been created by the arrival of the British and the Germans?

MAJOR McCABE: I would have to look that up to give you an accurate idea. I know that approximately 800 people are employed directly with the airport operation. That would include civilian operations as well.

The American operation, I believe, has up to about 200 people that they use that are contracted out, etc. The British and German, I am not exactly sure of the numbers there. I would have to look into that to give you any kind of an accurate idea.

MS McNEILL: It was just that I was using that as some idea of gauging. I thought you might have that number where we could see a definite gain in jobs. So then we can think abou the other European countries coming along. Because jobs is one of the strongest arguments for any new proposals in Labrador, and even when they were opening up the oil fields it was jobs, jobs, jobs. But actually no one could ever put a finger definitely on the jobs that could be picked up by the people who were looking for the jobs.

The desk study you mentioned, is that publicly available?

MAJOR McCABE: It has been released to the public, on request.

MS McNEILL: When they expand the present low flying in personnel and aircraft, have they made any requests for weapons as well?

MAJOR McCABE: Not live weapons. There has been, in effect, a continuation of what was initially examined in the 1981 initial evaluation. They have stated a requirement for practice areas. They have been looking for an area in the northern low level training areas, but to date we have not been able to find a suitable place that has been agreeable to all parties concerned.

MS McNEILL: When they are flying for 40 weeks, is that a continuous period or is that staggered? Does that mean that for 12 weeks of the year there would be no flying?

MAJOR McCABE: Again, I can only go by what is written down in this hypothetical scenario and the understanding is that there would be about that period required for basic things like leave for the personnel that are posted there, reorganizing things for the next training year, and all that kind of administrative duties.

Whether it would all be in one lump sum or not, I really do not know. That would come in the design and planning phase. I would suggest that the way the season goes here, one could logically assume that would probably be over the normal holiday season in the heart of the winter.

MS McNEILL: Okay, thank you.

MR. JONATHAN ROBINSON: I was wondering if you could explain that map to me a little bit more, and just clarify that that large circle, is that around Churchill Falls? Is that the City of Churchill Falls that you sort of have a circle around?

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, it is. That circle, incidentally, although a part of the red outlined area is around that, that circle is there anyway. That represents the terminal control area. That is just a normal air traffic control area. It has nothing to do with the military operation. But that is why we have put a bit of a curve on the southwest portion of that northern training area, to respect that area.

MR. ROBINSON: So, that is simply just because they have larger planes going into that area, is it?

MAJOR McCABE: In essence, yes.

MR. ROBINSON: The reason I am a little bit worried about it, and maybe I do not need to be, is that I am a little bit concerned that you have a very big circle around southern communities, protecting them, yet I see that red line going very close to Nain and Hopedale and Makkovik, and I just want to make sure that the reason the circle is big around other communities does not mean that it has been forgotten that there are other communities up on the north coast.

MAJOR McCABE: No, certainly not. As I say, it is really -- in fact if you look at the shape of those and wonder why they are not a rectangular or square shape, that particular map happens to show, which others do not from time to time -- that is an aeronautical map -- and what we have there are the areas

13B-20

set up inside an area which is bounded by established air traffic routes. If you look on there you will see little dotted lines which represent the normal air traffic routes, the highways of the air if you like, between certain communities which are fairly regularly used. The areas on the coast, just for information, any community has to be avoided in the sense that it can be overflown, but it has to be at a minimum of 2,000 feet above the community. I mean overflown, because if they fly out to the side of it, of course, they could be lower. We are trying to keep the people as far away from the communities as possible. One of the things we have run into problems with is an acknowledgement of the beauty of the area here, particularly the northern part of Labrador, and a lot of these people coming from Europe towards the end of their two or three week training period, have spare time on their hands, and will file a flight plan and go up north taking pictures.

That is why they are seen from time to time out here. But any time they are flying low, and I mean down to 100 feet, they have to be inside those areas. They can fly away from populated areas as low as 250 feet in some places, so it becomes really a judgement call from a person on the ground as to what is 100 feet, and what is 500 feet, and whatever. They are kind of noisy, and if it is very close, as far as you are concerned, they are low.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay, that is good. That

answers my question. I just have two more quick questions.

Your proposal for a live weapons zone: Is it likely that there will be a live weapons zone in the northern section? Is that reasonable to assume if you got a request for three live weapons zones?

MAJOR McCABE: That is correct. If they are established,then I would assume they would somewhere in that northern area. Those would tend to be probably closer -- and again, it is really a judgement thing -- to Goose Bay than further away.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. My next question is a very broad question. This NATO Tactical Weapons fighting zone: Can the military give any assurances that if this NATO expansion goes ahead, that nuclear weapons will never be involved in the Goose Bay base, or is that beyond your control really.

MAJOR McCABE: No, it is not. It is not beyond my control. I know exactly what kind of weapons that have been proposed, and nuclear is not one of them. They would be using conventional weapons, as we call them, only. That includes Cruise missile activity.

MR. ROBINSON: All right, let me just restate my question. What I wanted to know is can you give the public a commitment that there will not be nuclear weapons in Goose Bay related to this expansion.

MAJOR McCABE: It is Canadian government

-3B-22

policy,which is also publicly known, that no nuclear weapons are to be on Canadian soil.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay, that is good enough.

MR. ABE FLOWERS: I wonder if the planes -- I do not know how big they are -- but suppose some of them crashed in some of the lakes that run out into the rivers, how much harm would be done to the rivers?

MAJOR McCABE: Probably not any more harm than a civilian aircraft that might crash into them.

MR. FLOWERS: What about fuel spills from the planes? Would that have an effect on the lakes?

MAJOR McCABE: My answer is still the same. The civilian aircraft use fuel as well. Just to give you some statistics here: Because this kind of thing has been brought up, a concern about crashes, we did a study, an examination of existing information from about 1979 to date covering the period where there has really been a lot of low level flying. There have been about ten military aircraft that have crashed in the area that is generally used. We also went to Transport Canada, which is responsible for all civilian aviation, that is all the fellows who go up and down the coast, etc., and in that same time period over basically the same area, there were 367 crashes. Although, obviously, with an increase in aircraft you may have the possibility of an increase in crashes, there is no particular problem with it being a military aircraft or a civilian one really, from the sort of thing you are asking about. If the aircraft happened to have live weapons on it, yes, there is an added problem them. But that kind of thing does happen from time to time in our other training areas in Canada. And that is all looked after.

MR. FLOWERS: Where did the Allies do their low level flying in Canada before they came to Labrador?

MAJOR McCABE: Canada does very little low level flying. We have areas established right across Canada where low level flying is done by various kinds of aircraft. For example, the Canadian Forces does most of its fighter aircraft low level flying in Cold Lake, Alberta. They have a military training area there which is about one-tenth of the size of the area which we use in Labrador.

The Europeans have areas as well, but they are extremely small and, to give you an example, some of the areas where they can go down to 100 feet, the aircraft can only be down at that level for about two or three minutes before it has to come up again because of the densely populated areas.

As well, they are able to do some over water, but it is not very realistic training when you have to fight over land.

MR. FLOWERS: And what about Alaska. Has that been proposed for a NATO base?

MAJOR McCABE: No, it has not. Alaska is probably about as far away as you could ever get from the NATO countries. It would virtually impossible -- well, it would not be virtually impossible, but the time and the expense of getting aircraft all the way up to Alaska would be phenomenal. It just would not be worthwhile.

MR. FLOWERS: And is there any low level flying done in Turkey now?

MAJOR McCABE: The area that has been proposed is an existing military air force base. They do have in the training areas proposed some low level flying, yes.

MR. FLOWERS: And has there been any harm reported done to the environment over there?

MAJOR McCABE: I must confess, I do not know of any kind of reports that have been done. Turkey is a different kind of country than Canada. I know, for example, that in the training area there are one and one-half million people living and farming, raising sheep, wheat, etc. There are a lot of communities there. The training does go on. I am not aware of any kind of studies that have been done, or indeed even a concern for them.

MR. FLOWERS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I could add a little to your answer, Major, I want to point out that one of the subjects that will have to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement is the possibility of contamination of water courses. And within that subject area we would expect to see a discussion of the risk of such contamination coming from the crash of a military aircraft, for example, compared with the risks that exist at the present time involving the commercial civilian aircraft, or whatever.

So that subject is definitely going to be covered.

With respect to your question about whether low level flight training areas that exist now, we would expect National Defence, in its process of gathering information, to look at the situations elsewhere in Canada, and perhaps even in other countries, to try to obtain information on what sorts of effects have been felt from this kind of activity being carried on already.

Would anybody else care to ask a question?

Yes, sir.

MR. MORRIS JACQUE: I would like to know what kind of effect the low level flying would have on the trapping line 60 miles inside of Kaipokok Bay?

MAJOR McCABE: Obviously I cannot give you a definitive answer now. That is exactly the kind of thing that happens to be, and is covered in the Guidelines as far as the things that have to be examined during the study. Any potential effects of any kind, be it exhaust emissions or noise, etc. both on the animals that might be in an area like that, or the people that use it. All of that has to be examined.

MR. JACQUE: Has there been any study done anywhere at all about fur bearing animals from low level flying?

MAJOR McCABE: I am aware of studies that have been done. I think I mentioned earlier that in different parts of Canada, and in fact in different parts of the world, there have been studies done on the effects of aircraft in general. I am thinking more of helicopters and the very light single engine aircraft, for example, that might be used in the outfitter camps taking people back and forth. There have been some studies there. Up in the north I know some have been done.

We do not have as many studies, or as much information about the effects of military jets. There is one that is on-going right now in Labrador on jets and the caribou, for example, but it is only the caribou they are looking at.

MR. JACQUE: Your target practice out on the ocean, how far off the coast will that be?

MAJOR McCABE: Again, because that has not really been defined, it would really depend on where a suitable area could be found, if one could be found.

The obvious thing would be the shortest

distance to go would be the ideal for the purpose of saving fuel. But if the end of the shortest distance happens to be a major fish spawning ground or a couple of potential gas or oil fields or something like that, then they cannot establish that kind of an area.

They have to take all of that into consideration when they examine possible areas.

MR. JACQUE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions about the project at the present time?

Yes sir, go ahead.

MR. JONATHAN·ROBINSON: I just have one more. Your estimates for the base are on a cost-no-object plan, is that right? You mentioned that word, that you had been asked to design buildings and the structure with cost not in mind, is that right?

MAJOR McCABE: No, not to design the buildings, et cetera. When they mentioned no cost, they said, and I did not explain it properly in trying to shorten my presentation a bit. At the time they first decided to do a feasibility study on this, they went to each of the NATO nations and said: What are your annual training requirements; the types of training; numbers of missions? What are your current shortfalls, et cetera? They took all of that together, lumped it into one and said: Okay, we need a facility that is this big to be able to handle all that.

So, it is more a case of an idea of the numbers of the facilities, the numbers of hangars, for example, and things like that. They have not gotten into any design or anything like that.

MR. ROBINSON: The reason I asked the question is, it seems to me that your projections for jobs and benefits, are they based on this desired goal? What I am getting at is that I am a little worried that the benefits are based on this perfect plan, or this plan that would be as big as possible. But yet we have not heard, and as you admitted there are cutbacks everywhere. I am wondering if we can get a more realistic example from the military of what is likely to be there, and therefore the readjusted figures in terms of jobs. That is what I am concerned about.

One of the things we cannot control until they sit down and start planning this thing is exactly what size it is going to be, the scope of it. We do not have any control over that.

One of the biggest constraints will be available funding, because right now for example NATO does not have any money put aside for this NATO Centre. One would assume that we would have to look to proportionate funding from the participating countries, for example. But we can, we have already, and I am sure will continue to use the base at Cold Lake, Alberta, which has a similar size, both in personnel activity rate, numbers of aircraft and the types of training to what is being proposed here. And that base has been there for many, many years. So it serves as an excellent study site. In fact, the study I mentioned that is being done by National Defence on the socio-economic aspects of the proposals, did indeed look at what exists in Cold Lake; numbers of civilian jobs, and types, et cetera.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps now we could proceed to hear from the speakers, the people who have indicated that they would like to say something to the Panel.

Again, I think in order to make sure that Mrs. Bresnahan is heard before she has to leave, I would like to put her on first. So if she is ready, would she come forward please.

MRS. PAM BRESNAHAN: I do not have a brief to present. I have two question to ask; things I was hoping the Panel might ask to have addressed in the studies.

The first has to do with tourism, and specifically people who are interested in coming to Labrador for canoe tripping and kayaking and hiking and rock climbing. I know that this does not include a lot of people, and it is probably would not involve a great deal of money, but perhaps all of these small things, when added together, might carry some weight.

Labrador, for the people who are interested in using it as a wilderness tripping area, is a really unique area. For canoe tripping and kayaking, for instance, there are some spectacular rivers which, if you are flown inland to them, you can canoe or kayak down them and be in a beautiful wilderness setting that is pristine. Even though people have been trapping up those rivers and travelling them for years and years and years, for generations, it seems as though no one has been there before. That is unique.

The other thing that is unique about it is you are able to come out on to the ocean, so you can combine a river trip with an ocean trip, and travel along the ocean to one of the communities where you get another experience, a cultural experience, and where you can support the crafts in the town. So that is an economic support to the communities.

My concern about the effects of the low level flying on this aspect of tourism comes from direct personal experience.

My husband and I did a trip down the Adlatok River, sometimes it is referred to as the Ujutok River, a couple of years ago. I am not sure how many days we had been on the river at this particular point, but we were feeling very relaxed and a part of the countryside and marvelling at how untouched it seemed when, all of a sudden, we were buzzed, not buzzed but a low level plane came over. I have never been so terrified in my life as I was then. I was in a canoe,in white water, and I just hit the bottom of the canoe.

We did not expect that it would happen again, and we were portaging through some woods and we heard one. It did not come directly over us. I do not know how far away it was, but I dropped everything and hit the ground. That is the impact it had on me.

My husband has since been on another trip, and he did not have that experience. So we would trip again in Labrador, knowing that it might only happen once on a trip, or maybe not at all. But with the increases proposed in the number of planes flying to, what is it, 300 per day going out. How many go out now per day?

MAJOR McCABE: A maximum of about 100.

MRS. BRESNAHAN: Yes. So it would increase the chances enough that we would certainly think twice, and probably decide not spend the money that it costs to do such a trip.

I know that many of our friends are interested in tripping in this area. Many of our friends have. People come from all across Canada and we have known people that have come from as far away as southern California. They have spent the money to come up to Labrador because they think it is so beautiful. I do not think they would do it if there was that increase in low level flying.

That was my first point.

The other thing that sort of comes from that experience is the effect of that sound -- the sound of the planes just struck me as being so loud. It seems to me that people have spoken a lot on the media, the media has spoken a lot about the sound of the jets, and it has been likened to the sound of a snowmobile. On "The Journal" a few weeks ago, when they showed the jets flying and they supposedly gave a true account of the sound. I imagine they were trying to get across the impression that they were giving a true account of the sound, but they did not come close to what it sounds like.

I am wondering whether some hard facts could not be presented about loud the sound really is, like a decibel reading of the sound of an airplane when it is flying right above you, 50 feet above or however low they come. Also, perhaps compare that, have a decibel reading of snowmobile and a chain saw and sounds that people hear regularly.

I do not know whether this can be studied, but I wonder whether some study can be done about the impact of that sound when it comes upon you like that, and then is gone again, as opposed to when you are prepared to the sound, when your snowmobile can go on and you are all set for your chain saw to make the noise that it makes.

I could not believe the effect it had on me. It must have a similar effect, if not worse, on the animals. I know I would not want to be exposed to that very often. If I had the choice as an animal, I would leave.

So, that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I

do not know if you happen to be aware of this or not, but there is a study going on at the present time, being conducted by the Canadian Public Health Association at the request of the Newfoundland Department of Health, which is looking at human health effects of noise from low flying aircraft of the sort we are talking about here.

That is looking, I believe, not only at physical effects, that is health effects and that sort of thing, but also at psychological effects. It does include readings of the noise levels from these aircraft, so I have been given to understand.

There has been an interim report from the CPHA, it came out some weeks ago, and the final report is expected some time later this fall. This Panel will be given a copy of that report, and then copies will be available on request to you, or to anyone else who would like to have one. That would certainly serve as an important source of information for us and for the Environmental Impact Statement.

Whether there would be other readings of noise levels taken by somebody else, I do not know. At the moment I would think it quite reasonable to do that sort of thing.

Thank you very much.

Some of the speakers who have given us their names have expressed a preference for this afternoon. Others for this evening.

We will go on now, keeping that in mind.

13B-34

We will continue on in the approximate order in which we received the names in the first place.

The next speaker would be Mr. Jonathan Robinson, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. JONATHAN ROBINSON:

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Panel.

My name is Jonathan Robinson, and I am trained as an economist and as a teacher. I am speaking to you from that perspective.

I am speaking to you from the perspective of someone who has lived here for three years and has tried to become involved in the lifestyle that is lived here. I do not pretend I have a full understanding, but just to let you know where I am coming from.

I have two sets of questions. One is a question perhaps directed to Dr. Barnes, some questions about the Panel itself. Then I have my presentation which I guess is directed to the whole Panel.

I am little bit concerned that on the Panel you do not have, Dr. Barnes, or it does not seem to me that you have anyone whose livelihood depends on the use of the land. I wonder if you could explain why there is not anyone on your Panel that does depend on the land for their livelihood.

THE CHAIRMAN: To begin to answer, your supposition is correct. I would not say that we do

Robinson, Sub.

13B-35

have anyone on our Panel in that category.

What we have attempted to do, I think, is what other panels have done in the past, and that is have persons appointed to the Panel who have a knowledge of the various population groups who could be affected by the project. We attempt to find people with some measure of technical and scientific background as well, wherever possible.

We have to keep the size of the panels down to a reasonable number. We original had seven persons on this Panel. Unfortunately one person has found it necesary to resign, and we are seeking a replacement at the present time.

Perhaps to get into that sort of level of expertise, for all of the groups involved, would enlarge the Panel beyond what would be a reasonable size. It may not be a very good answer from some people's point of view, but it is as good as I can give.

MR. ROBINSON: My comment on that would be that I think as the Panel goes along, we are going to struggle increasingly with what it means when people talk about the meaning of the land to them, and how hard that is to define. You are an excellent Panel, and you bring to it a lot of skills, but I would have liked to have seen someone who lives and works on the land, who could maybe help you articulate that view.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other things, Mr.

Robinson, Sub.

Robinson, which I do not believe I mentioned before. That is, a group of experts is being assembled at the present time to assist the Panel in other subject areas. At least one of those experts is a gentleman who resides in a small community in northern Quebec. He is an Inuit person with, I would say, excellent qualifications from the category that you just mentioned. He is a hunter and trapper, and I will take note of your inquiry in this area, and as we look into the possibility of getting some other people in that category into that group of advisors that is being put together at the present time.

Thank you for the suggestion.

DR. PAUL WILKINSON: May I just add one thing to that. It is that I was nominated to sit on this Panel by the Kativik Regional Government, which is the regional government that represents the population in Quebec north of the 55th parallel, which is predominantly Inuit and Naskapis.

I understand that they did debate the issue of whether they should nominate to the Panel a person who is directly dependant on the land, or some other kind of person.

I am the result of their deliberations, probably a compromise candidate to some extent in that to some extent I have worked with Native people in pretty much every area from Alaska to northern Quebec for about 20 years. And, at the same time, I have a separate and scientific background.

So, at least in our case, the Native people of northern Quebec were given the opportunity to do what you suggest. The result is that I am on the Panel, and there is then a technical advisor someone who is directly dependent on the land.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. My second question is...

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you excuse me for a moment.

MR. WILLIAM JOURDAIN: Please excuse my English.

I am an Indian from Seven Islands, and my father was very dependent on wildlife. I was asked by the organization named CAM, Conseil Attikamek Montagnais, to be part of this Panel.

I do not have a university diploma, but I think I can help this Panel to understand what it is to be dependent on wildlife.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other thing that I would like to mention is that an opportunity was given to another of the Native populations that may be impacted by this project to nominate two or three persons to the Minister of the Environment from which he might chose to appoint a Panel member. Unfortunately that group declined to do so.

MR. ROBINSON: My second question is one you have probably heard many times before, but I

13B-38

Robinson, Sub.

would like to ask it again just so you know there is concern here for that. And that is, the mandate of your Panel to, if the Environmental Impact Study indicates that low level flying is dangerous, seek to broaden your mandate to recommend no low level flying?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to the present activity, or the possible expansion?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes. My understanding at the moment is that you can say we should not have any more, but you cannot say we should not have any. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the proper way to answer that is to say that the Panel has not been asked in its mandate to recommend whether or not the present low level flying activity should be continued or not. It has been suggested to us more than once in this round of meetings that we should consider whether our mandate should be expanded in that regard. What we have said is that when the Panel meets in November to draw up the final form of the Guidelines, that we will look carefully at that suggestion, and other suggestions related to our mandate, and reach some conclusion on them and, if necessary, take appropriate action.

Beyond that, once we have gotten the Guidelines out of the way, which is our first priority at the present time, the Panel will publish some sort of interim report to the public on this activity so far in which we would indicate our response to all these suggestions such as yours today.

MR. ROBINSON: Those are my questions for the Panel. I will just move on to my own particular concerns now.

I am sorry to see Colonel John David was not here because I had a discussion with him last year at the Military Awareness. So, Mr. McCabe, a lot of my references are to Colonel John David. I hope that you can maybe clarify things for him if I say things that are not correct.

My first concern is with the caribou hunt. I realize that you are planning to study that and I guess my concern with that is that at the Military Awareness Seminars last year Lieutenant-Colonel John David said that in 18 years of experience of flying over caribou, in his opinion, they were not particularly affected. What I would like to see as part of your Panel is that we have filming of low level flying over caribou herds and that that filming be available to people so that we can actually see what caribou do when planes fly over their heads. That is one suggestion I have.

I would also like to suggest that in the Impact Statement you are going to have to quantify the thing in dollars, I think. As an economist I can tell you that the caribou herd can be fairly quickly added up in terms of what it is worth but it seems to

Robinson, Sub.

me that it is not just a source of cheap meat. I would urge you to make sure that, even if we decide that low level flying will ruin the caribou herd, the answer cannot be, well, you know, send up some more hamburger.

I went on the deer hunt myself last year and it seemed to me that it might not even be a cheap source of meat when you add up everything but, clearly, to the people here, it is a really, really important part of their life and especially in an area where you have high unemployment. This is a really meaningful experience and activity that goes on and, to me, the issue is not even economic but it is, rather, social.

I would just urge the Panel not to just see it in dollar terms. If you do see it in dollar terms, be sure to add up the social costs and the cost that is involved there, because I think they are really high.

I would also like to make sure that the Panel has a really rigorous study, because it seems to me that the renewable resources in Labrador, if you take things like the fishery where, for years, they were saying that the draggers were not harming it and now they are admitting they are, this area of the country seems to have been cheated time and time again by Environmental Impact Statement. It was cheated on the Churchill Falls where there are no fish in Lake Melville.

Robinson, Sub.

So I am just asking you to have a very, very rigorous study because it seems to me that things were not done here before as they might have been.

The other concern I have is that we separate the people who will benefit from this project from the people who are going to suffer.

The people in Goose Bay have a really good point; that spending $800 million in a town of 5000 people is definitely going to create some jobs. I do not see how it could not. But, when I asked Lieutenant-Colonel John David last year for one benefit for the community of Makkovik, he kind of sat and thought and he could not come up with any. His answer was: You can go to Goose Bay and get a teaching job. I said: You did not hear what I said. I like it in Makkovik and I want to know of a benefit to Makkovik. He did not have any suggestions.

So what I am suggesting is that, when you add up the benefits, understand that those, in all likelihood, are going to go to people in Goose Bay, and the costs are likely going to be borne by the people on the north and south coast. I think we need to separate those, because, so often, when we look at Impact Statements, we have a group of people saying: Do we want to trade this for this? Do we want to trade this for this? Whereas here, it is a little bit different. I think the people benefiting are different from the people bearing the costs.

I would like to give you just a little

Robinson, Sub.

example that may sound ridiculous but the government decides it is going to spend $800 million to expand hunting and fishing in northern Labrador and, of course, it talks about all the jobs that are going to go on northern Labrador by spending $800 million. But, it says, to do this, we have to stop the military expansion in Goose Bay.

I am sure the people in Goose Bay would be really upset because they would say: We are not going to get anything out of hunting and fishing.

I use that example to illustrate that that is possibly how the people on the north coast feel, or some of them.

I guess, as a teacher, the other thing that I am concerned about is that, with the increased expansion in Goose Bay, it is not just going to be that $800 million that is spent in Goose Bay but the priorities for schools and health care may become Goose Bay again.

Makkovik here, for instance, does not have a gym and, yet, if we need another school in Goose Bay, I am wondering if the provincial monies that would go to Labrador will be spent in Goose Bay instead of on the north coast, and when those government figures come out, they will say: We have spent millions of dollars in Labrador. But is the north coast going to get those dollars, and is it even going to lose more dollars because we are spending money in Goose Bay to support the spin-offs?

Robinson, Sub.

I now have a concern about the tactical weapons fighting zone.

I am really concerned that, when the military gains access to Labrador, that their activities will become a priority over the local use of the land.

Once again last year, at the Awareness Seminars, I asked Lieutenant-Colonel John David what is going to happen if somebody wants to go out hunting and you are doing low level flying.

His answer was: No problem. They pick up the phone, they phone the base, they tell them where they are going and we will not go flying that day.

My problem with that is that that kind of answer underlines to me a misunderstanding of how the land is used, and that hunters do not go at nine o'clock and come back at five and that they may get stuck and that they go when the wind stops blowing.

If you are going to share the land, you have to have a really good mechanism for sharing that land. My suggestion was: Is it going to be a toll-free number? Who is going to pay for the phone calls?

I am just very concerned that if there is a way to share the land -- and I am not sure there is, but if there is -- I would like to make sure the costs for that are borne by the people wanting the expansion, by National Defence, and not by asking local people to make long-distance phone calls to ask to

Robinson, Sub.

use their land, because that is the answer that I got last year.

My other concern is with the tactical weapons fighting zone. You will have to tell me, Major McCabe, if I am way off base here, but we had some hunters that were lost here 13 years ago. They were out on the land for two or three weeks and everybody wrote them off as dead, but they were found and they survived.

I am just wondering what is going to happen if you have a live weapons zone and we have hunters that get lost. Is all low level flying going to stop until they are found? Or just what is going to happen to those people?

It seems to me that, when a person loses his Ski-doo after he was only 200 feet away from it, he is very easily going to be able to walk into a live weapons zone. It may sound ridiculous but it seems to me that we are setting up a system where the military, which is here to protect us, may end up killing one of our own people.

It is maybe a long shot but, if you are going to be here for the long term, over ten or 20 years, it is entirely possible that that might happen. I am very concerned about that.

I just have two more concerns.

This is something that is really hard to study and I do not really expect you to be able to incorporate much, but I have two concerns if Goose

Robinson, Sub.

Bay becomes a NATO base: One is the threat of terrorism; and the other threat is nuclear war.

Terrorism is increasing fairly rapidly and if Goose Bay is a NATO base, we are going to be the subject of anti-British and anti-American sentiment. I am just not sure how we deal with that or how we weigh that.

I think that your Panel has a responsibility to make people aware that, by having a NATO base there, you open yourself up to all kinds of terrorist acts.

Once again, we may not ever see it but we know those things strike at innocent people. I think we have to weigh that somewhere in the equation,and I do not know how you will do it.

The other is just that there is supposed to be a better than 50/50 chance that we have a nuclear war within the next generation,and that the current Soviet policy is that they are targeting every city over 50,000, plus military bases.

That means that we are going to be definitely a nuclear target. Last week, the Soviets launched a missile and missed by 100 miles. I do not need to tell you what happens if you miss Goose Bay by 100 miles.

I realize that is probably beyond your scope but, at the same time, it is something that people need to be aware of, that we are opening ourselves up to that threat more than if we do not have it.

Robinson, Sub.

My last concern is just a very broad concern. I want you to know that I would oppose military expansion, whether it was in Labrador or anywhere else, just because of the $800 million that is being spent,and could it be spent better somewhere else?

The only reason I mention that is that during the Ethiopian famine last year, the people of northern Canada were the most generous people in the world. They gave more money than anybody else to help those people in Africa.

This is $800 million but it is their money, it is tax dollars. I am wondering if that is the best use of those dollars. If they had that $800 million to spend on either their own development or development somewhere else, if it might not be better spent somewhere else?

I just want to say that I am really proud of the Canadian military. We have the best peace-keeping force in the world. But I am disappointed that we are not putting money into peace-keeping, that we are putting it somewhere else.

Those are all my concerns. I do not know if you want to respond to any of them but that is all of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I would like to make only one general comment, unless there is some particular question that you would like me to try to answer.

I would say that we have heard many of these concerns and questions from other persons, but I believe that you have done perhaps a better job than some of the others of presenting these in a very unemotional and rational manner.

Thank you very much.

Yes, there is one point. The telephone number by which people can notify the military concerning plans to go into the country is a toll-free number to the best of my knowledge.

Is that not so, Major? It is not a toll-free number? Perhaps something might be done about that, then.

Go ahead.

MAJOR McCABE: First of all, that was recommended, the setting up of a toll-free number and that is being examined.

The number at the military co-ordination centre, they will take collect calls, so the end is the same and we encourage people to do that.

I must take exception to your quote of Colonel David's statement that, if the people go to the country and they phone in and tell him, that they will not fly that day.

That is not the purpose at all. What they say, and the whole point is, if we are told or contacted, as we have some people doing already, and they say: This is where we are going, as I mentioned in my presentation, they will mark that on map and they will not go flying by that. You do not shut down a base because someone has gone out in 100,000 square kilometre area. So I must correct that.

MR. ROBINSON: I am glad you clarified it, that is good.

MAJOR McCABE: The point is to try and avoid the people.

We have a big area that we use there right now and it has been our position so far that there is room for everybody. We all want to try and co-operate and avoid the known areas. That is why we encourage people letting us know. We try and do our best on that.

MR. ROBINSON: Can I just stop you there?

MAJOR McCABE: Sure.

MR. ROBINSON: So I want to understand this that, if the military is using that land and people want to use it as well, they are going to have to give you, shall we say, a week's notice or what kind of notice would they have to give, if they want to make sure that they are not going to be over-flown?

MAJOR McCABE: When people go out into the area, usually they either tell us how long they are going to be there or we will even make an assumption.

For example, we go out sometimes and some of the air crew will notice a camp which we do not know about. When they get back, even though we do not know who is there, the fact that there is somebody there, that is marked on a map and that is avoided for at least two weeks.

Then, it is checked again to see if there are people there. So we automatically avoid the area or mark it as a restricted zone, if you like, for two or three weeks. Or if we know it is going to be a month or something, then that will remain a restricted area. So that is the point there, okay?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MAJOR McCABE: The other thing, your concern about hunters getting lost and that, wandering into the zones, any zone or weapons area, as we have one right now, it is marked. I would think that hunters, from what I know of the experienced hunters and users of the land, certainly do not actually move around if they are lost, if the weather is bad enough that they cannot see. They are not going to wander around in a storm. I would think that they are going to stay in one place until the weather is good enough, at which point, if they are then going to move, they would see an area that was signed.

Now, when these areas are located, we ensure that they are not areas that are used for any other kind of thing, like, maybe an archaeological concern or whatever. So we do take a lot of steps to ensure that this kind of thing that you are considering will not happen.

Now, sure, one can paint all sorts

of pictures. There may be a remote chance that something will happen but you have to weigh it, but we do take steps to ensure that, as much as possible, that kind of thing will not happen.

MR. ROBINSON: If I could just stop you there, I think that is one example whereby, once the military marks out that land in many ways the people are going to take a second priority to the military in that.

If ten years down the road someone is lost and they go walking along and they come to a live weapons zone, are they supposed to walk around it?

That is my point. Once you use the land, it is very hard for other people to use it as well in a way that is perfectly normal for them to want to use it.

MAJOR McCABE: The size of the area out there and the places that we would pick to establish a zone are areas that are just probably not going to be used. That is the whole point of doing this study in the first place.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay.

MAJOR McCABE: It is to try and establish that.

The other thing, very quickly, your concern about terrorism, I think that is a concern that we share throughout the world and I would suggest that there are more acts of terrorism going on in civilian airports than there are in military ones.

In fact, the added security that might exist on a military airfield would, in fact, probably reduce the chances of acts of terrorism.

Now, as far as protests or whatever, that is a different thing because it s a democratic society.

The concern about nuclear war, that has come up before. The thing that we try and point out to people is we are talking about establishing a training facility here, not an operational base, as we have throughout Europe, a lot of operational airfields or army bases which are typically targeted.

In time of hostilities or even times of tension, the aircraft that would be at Goose Bay training would all repatriate to Europe. So it would revert back to basically what it was in the Second World War, I suppose.

MR. ROBINSON: My understanding of a nuclear war is we are a 26-minute delivery time from the Soviet Union and those planes are there today or, if they are there next year, they will be targeted. They will not assume: Well, they are going to move the planes. It would make sense to target them, in that you can deliver more quickly than perhaps you can get those planes out of there.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, but now we get into the business of are we going to have -- and it is a difference of opinion discussed by philosophers, et cetera --

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MAJOR McCABE: ...is it going to be an escalation or is there going to be no notice?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes.

MAJOR McCABE: If it is no notice, I would suggest we probably do not have to worry about it, anyway.

The last thing, I was not too clear when you were talking about that $800 million.

Just to clarify, that is not Canadian money. I was not sure...

MR. ROBINSON: No, I realize that.

MAJOR McCABE: I was not sure.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, that was my point in saying that that is money coming from all over the world and it is going into military and maybe it could go somewhere else.

MAJOR McCABE: Yes, okay.

The last thing I wanted to mention is money could be possibly spent better on peace-keeping.

I should say that one of the whole points -- again, it is a philosophical thing, possibly, or policy -- but we have, ever since the Second World War, tried to maintain peace and we have succeeded for the most part by having the deterrent effect.

So money is put into that. Now, again, people argue that but we are into peace-keeping, believe me.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes. I was specifically referring to your activities in Cyrpus or in Lebanon where Canadians go where no one else can go because of your record, a record that you should be proud of.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next speaker in order on the schedule is Mr. William Andersen, Senior, but I do not believe he is in the room at the present time.

Is Mrs. Ruth Flowers here? If you are willing to go on now, we would be pleased to hear from you, ma'am.

---SUBMISSION BY MRS. RUTH FLOWERS:

MRS. RUTH FLOWERS: I thank you for this opportunity. My name is Ruth Flowers and Makkovik is my home town.

First, I would just like to quote an excerpt that I took from a passage in the Toronto Globe and Mail on the 25th of October, 1985. It is a news item that was written by a Mr. Matthew Fisher and I will just quote:

> «Another selling feature is that pilots would be able to fly at supersonic speeds as low as 15 metres above the ground, except near towns, bird colonies along the coast and caribou herds inland.»

My concern is: Are you aware of just

Flowers, Sub.

where the different bird colonies are along the different areas of the coastline?

Flying at 15 metres is surely not much more than twice the height of this building. How can we be sure that flying at such a low altitude the environment will not be affected by exhaust fumes?

Our people depend largely on things from the land: berries, small game, for example, birds, rabbits, Arctic hare, et cetera. If these things, like berries, small game, moss, lichen, and those things are destroyed, we can be almost certain that the caribou will leave that area.

All these things we depend upon largely. Greenpeace, a few years ago, destroyed our way of life in the seal fishery. Our people depended largely on the seal hunt, especially in the spring of the year for food and to supplement their incomes. At this particular time of the year, there is no employment and fresh meat is hard to come by and almost unaffordable at the stores when people have no income.

I would like to add that I am not against development and progress. Goodness knows, we need employment and I know that Goose Bay needs some kind of big works to boost its economy. It is just too bad that it has to be a works in the form of a NATO base and expanded low level flying.

I cannot help but get a feeling that,

by supporting a NATO base, that I am in some way supporting the nuclear arms race but, then, I guess, no matter where a NATO base goes, should a war start, we will all be affected, no matter where the bomb is dropped.

Those are a few of my concerns and not by any means all of them. They are a big concern.

Another one is what impact the impact on social and the human health aspect of it will be.

Those are some of my concerns and I thank you for hearing them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Flowers.

Now, I am not quite sure how to go on from here because all of the other speakers, except Mr. William Andersen, Senior, have indicated a wish to speak to us this evening, instead of this afternoon.

Perhaps I could open it up generally, if there is anyone here now who would like to have something to say, even though you have not given us your name already, that does not matter.

Would you like to come forward and either make a statement of some sort or ask a question? We are still ten minutes away from our appointed adjournment time for this afternoon.

Yes, ma'am. Please come forward.

---SUBMISSIONS BY MS ENID McNEILL:

MS ENID McNEILL: I did not have anything prepared in writing but I did have two

McNeill, Sub.

concerns.

All along I had also thought that the $800 million was Canadian but I am sure a large lump of that must be Canadian. I am wondering where is a place to produce a study to show what could be done to develop our renewable resources with the input of money that is going to be put by the Canadian government into this low flying expansion or the NATO base.

We have such a wealth of renewable resources, it seems such a shame to damage them the way I imagine it is partly going to be damaged.

The other concern is the forest fires, after that one down in the Maritimes last summer.

What facilities are going to be put in place around these weapons ranges to control fires? They never had adequate facilities down south. I do not know if it was a rogue commander or whoever it was that let off live ammunition when the forest fire index was extremely high.

What guarantees are we going to have that something like that does not happen when our area is open for such weapons training?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Major McCabe might like to respond to that concern.

MAJOR McCABE: A couple of things.

Usually, where we have a facility used

McNeill, Sub.

for live weapons that can cause fires, we try and get the impact point, if you like, the areas where we actually land, to be a point that is, for example, like the practice weapons ranges, very sandy or where there really is reduced chance of fire.

In Cold Lake, for example, also, when the forest fire index is high, then we are restricted to practice weapons, for example, which cannot cause fires. But we do have all sorts of policies for that.

The situation in Gagetown, yes, indeed, did get out of hand but it was a few more circumstances than sort of meet the eye. We also have, of course, as I saw, the damage done by the forest fire in Labrador -- what was it? -- two years ago now. These things do happen.

We, in fact, probably have a better chance of controlling that kind of thing than the natural situation.

Usually, in a live weapons range that, for example, is manned, we have fire-fighting equipment right on the spot that is kept there full-time while there is training going on.

So we do look after that kind of thing but, sure, accidents do happen but they do happen with other things, too. The concern is something that we look after.

You had another question that I have forgotten the first part that I wanted to comment on.

McNeill, Sub.

Oh, with the money.

MS McNEILL: Yes.

MAJOR McCABE: I just to explain a bit, and from time to time it does come out in my presentation, to give you an example, the current activity, the users, I mentioned that ten-year agreement that everyone has signed, within that agreement there are two types of things identified: One is called common use facilities; and one is dedicated use.

Dedicated use facilities, like hangars and barracks, et cetera, that a country has for its own use, they pay for a hundred per cent themselves, it is totally their cost.

Common use facilities, like the radar, runway upkeep and things like that, are shared on an equal cost basis which, again, is of benefit to all concerned but particularly Canada.

Instead of, for example, the years we have had the military in there, or recent times, rather than Canada paying a hundred per cent for all of the upkeep of the airport, we have been paying a much smaller amount and, right now, we are paying 25 per cent rather than 100 per cent of a lot of the stuff.

So there are benefits to Canada for having it and, as we know, things cost so much these days, particularly in running and airfield, so there

McNeill, Sub.

is that positive side of it.

The NATO Centre, that $800 million that has been used, I would hate to see it used. It is a figure that has been misused and abused and everything else.

We do not know what the thing will cost but I cannot really agree with you that a very large part would come from Canada.

For example, we do very little training ourselves in Goose Bay and we do not put very much money into it from the Canadian military aspect. I do not think you would see a large part of that.

Canada is not a nation that has a lot of money. The countries that have a large amount of money that is spent on military are elsewhere, not Canada. That is why we are trying to encourage a little to come in.

For years, for example, ever since NATO existed, Canada has been putting money east across the ocean into NATO. We are trying to get a little bit of recognition for that, if you like, and have some NATO money put into Canada instead of it being a one way funnel.

MS McNEILL: You do not have any idea how much it would be? Would it be 50 million or 10 million?

MAJOR McCABE: I appreciate that, ma'am, and we have an idea how much a full-scale

McNeill, Sub.

facility will cost but that is the sort of thing that comes out in the planning and design phase when we see what is actually going to be built and what things actually cost that year, whatever it might be.

So we can get a rough idea beforehand, based on an assumption that certain things are going to be built and that is all we can go by.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Is there anybody else who wishes to speak at this time?

If not, then, I think we will adjourn the meeting for the time being.

I would appreciate if all of you can come back here again this evening. Please encourage your friends and neighbours to come out. I realize it is Hallowe'en and people might have certain responsibilities but, while we are here, we would like to hear from as many of the residents of Makkovik as we can possibly have.

So we will come back again at seven o'clock this evening. Thank you very much.

---Dinner adjournment

---Upon resuming at 7:00 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of Makkovik and Postville. Welcome to our meeting.

My name is David Barnes. I work for the Federal Government and I am the Chairman of this group of people seated before you this evening, which we call an Environmental Assessment Panel.

We have come here today to sit down and talk with you about a proposed military project to be established in Goose Bay and which involves flying exercises over parts of Labrador and parts of the Province of Quebec.

I will explain a bit about the purpose of the meeting and the purpose of this whole exercise in a few minutes but, first, I would like to introduce to you the other members of the Panel.

Beginning at the end of the table at your left, near the window, is Mr. Don Stewart.

Mr. Stewart is a retired Brigadier-General from the Canadian Armed Forces. His last position was Deputy Commander of one of the NORAD regions and he was stationed for a time in Goose Bay.

He presently lives near Ottawa where he operates a small farm.

Mr. Stewart brings to this Panel his knowledge and expertise on the subject of military aircraft and their operations.

Next to Mr. Stewart is Mr. Tom Northcott.

Mr. Northcott lives in St. John's. He is a biologist who has extensive experience with wildlife in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. He was, for a time, employed with the Wildlife Division of the provincial government. He now is Vice-president of a consulting firm located in St. John's, known as Northland Associates LImited.

As I mentioned this afternoon, I really do not need to introduce the next gentleman. For the record, I will mention his name: Mr. Tim McNeill, but I am sure you do not need to know who he is and what he does.

I would say that he has been appointed to this Panel because it is felt that he has a great deal to offer by way of information on the interests and the concerns of the Inuit people of Labrador.

On my left is Mr. William Jourdain.

Mr. Jourdain lives in Sept-Iles, Quebec, where he has been very active in the affairs of the Montagnais Indian Band Council.

He has also been involved in commercial interests in the Town of Sept-Iles and, prior to his retirement, he worked for the Iron Ore Company of Canada for approximately 25 years.

At the other end of the table is Dr. Paul Wilkinson.

Dr. Wilkinson is a biologist who works with the Naskapi people of northern Quebec. He is currently a consultant established in Montreal where he lives and he was involved in the negotiation of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement as an advisor to the Naskapis,and is still involved in the implementation of that Agreement.

I work in the Federal Environmental

Assessment Review Office, a federal government office, located in Hull, Quebec, across the river from Ottawa where, for about one year now, I have been Director for the Atlantic Region for that office.

Just a word, then, about why we are here.

In 1973 the Government of Canada established a process under which environmental assessments may be conducted for development projects for which the Government of Canada is responsible. The process is called the Environmental Assessment and Review Process, or EARP for short.

Under the first stage of that process, it is the responsibility of any department of the federal government which has a proposal to put forward for a project to examine that proposal internally to determine whether or not the project is likely to cause significant environmental impacts or whether it is likely to raise serious concerns in the minds of the public.

If either of those two situations exists, then that department must refer the project to the Minister of the Environment and ask him to conduct a public environmental review.

So it was, then, that in February of this year, the Department of National Defence wrote to the Minister of Environment, describing a project, including both existing and proposed activities of a military nature and asking the Minister to appoint an Environmental Assessment Panel which would conduct a review.

The Minister appointed this Panel in July and instructed it to carry out the review and, in particular, gave it a mandate which is contained in a document called the Terms of Reference for the Panel. That document has been distributed fairly widely; there are still unlimited copies of it around for anybody who would like to see it.

This Panel is going to carry out its work, first of all, by asking the Department of National Defence to prepare a major report, called an Environmental Impact Statement. That report will set out, from the point of view of National Defence, a description of the proposed project, a prediction of the environmental effects that are likely to occur, and when we say «environmental», we mean both with regard to the natural environment, that is, the land, the water, the animals, et cetera, and to the human environment, the cultural and social conditions, the economic base for the communities that may be affected, all this sort of thing must also be considered.

When the Environmental Impact Statement has been submitted, the Panel will examine it, will listen to what the public has to say about it and will then write its own report to the government.

At the present time, what the Panel is attempting to do is to put together a set of instructions to be given to National Defence to guide it through the process of writing the Environmental Impact Statement.

Those instructions will be contained in a document which we call the Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

In order to involve the public in the preparation of that Guidelines document, the Panel issued a preliminary or draft form of that document in August of this year and distributed it to a great many people, we hope, in all of the communities that may be affected by this project.

We have allowed a certain period of time for people to see that document and we are now involved in a series of meetings -- we are actually coming quite close to the end of that series of meetings now which have gone on through the months of September and October -- in which we go into the communities, talk to the people about the project, listen to what they have to say, first of all, about the Draft Guidelines document, if they have had an opportunity to look at it and form some opinion about it but, also, to hear other kinds of comments about the project, how the people feel about it, what worries or concerns they may have in their minds about the possible effects, and, after these meetings are all over, the Panel will use all of this information that it is receiving to decide how the Guidelines document needs to be improved.

We want to make sure that the Guidelines, in their final form, cover all of the right subjects, raise all of the important issues and give some directions to National Defence on how to write a complete and satisfactory Environmental Impact Statement.

The Panel hopes to be ready to deliver that final form of the Guidelines to National Defence sometime in December of this year.

National Defence will then begin the process of gathering together information from a great many sources and they may also have to carry out some new studies to produce information that is needed but does not exist at the present time.

When they have completed that work, they will sit down and write the document, which may be available to be presented to the Panel some time in the early summer of 1987. That is a tentative date, a possible date.

When the Impact Statement has been presented to the Panel, it will immediately be distributed to the public, so that, while the Panel is examining the document, the public will also have the same length of time in which to examine it and to put together any comments that they may want to make.

When the Panel is satisfied that the Impact Statement is satisfactory, that is that it has met all of the requirements in the Guidelines document, the Panel will announce the holding of public hearings. Those hearings will be, in many ways, similar to the meeting that we are having here today, though it may be a little more formal in some ways.

At those hearings, the Panel will invite the public to discuss the project and discuss the Impact Statement, and when the hearings are over, the Panel will proceed to write its own report to the government concerning the project, the expected environmental impacts, the seriousness of those impacts, the various ways and means which may be available to deal with those impacts and will make recommendations to the government on whether or not the project is acceptable from an environmental point of view.

If things move along the sort of time schedule that we are expecting, the Panel expects to be able to present its final report to the government some time late in 1987 or early 1988.

Now, since the main object of these meetings is this Guidelines document which I have mentioned, I would like to tell you very briefly what it contains.

As I said, it will be a sort of instruction book to National Defence to be used in preparing its Environmental Impact Statement. It will involve some definitions of important terms which may be unfamiliar to some people. It will contain an introductory section. It will talk about the scope and breadth of the review. It will give some instructions regarding the methods that the Panel wants National Defence to use in preparing the document.

Perhaps the most important section of the Guidelines will set out the issues that the Panel has identified that must be covered in the Environmental Impact Statement, those concerns which are highest in the minds of the people who may be affected and, also, the highest in the minds of the wildlife biologists, for example, and other people who are concerned with impacts on the environment.

Because these issues are so important, I am going to take enough time to read each of them to you so you can see those issues which the Panel had identified up to August of this year, at the time when the Draft Guidelines were published. It may be that, in examining all of the information that the Panel is receiving in these meetings, it may decide that other issues are also important and need to be added to the list or we might be convinced that the list could be shortened or changed in some other way.

For the time being, then, in the Draft, the issues are as follows:

Number one, the effects of low flying aircraft noise on humans and on wildlife.

Number two, the effects of low level military training on subsistence lifestyles and land use.

Number three, the opportunities for economic development in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and in other communities in the project area.

Number four, the impacts of the project on commercial activities which are based on renewable resources.

Number five, the impacts on the natural environment of, first of all, construction activities associated with possible expansion of Goose Bay Airport and, secondly, the impacts of exhaust emissions from aircraft due to increased flying activities.

Issue number six is the cumulative or additive effects of the project, together with any other projects and activities that may be going on in the region. This is because virtually any activity undertaken by man has some effect on the environment and perhaps also on his own life or the life of other people, so that one might imagine that this project that we have been asked to review might, combined with some other project going on at the same time in the same area, produce effects which would be greater than the effects of this project alone.

Issue number seven deals with the need for monitoring, that is, watching over the project, if it is approved, monitoring during construction phrases, perhaps, during operation and giving consideration right through the possible closedown of the project, if that should ever happen.

Issue number eight is the impacts of land and sea weapons and training ranges.

Issue number nine, the effects of the project on the outcome of negotiations concerning Native land claims.

The final section of the Guidelines would set out the Table of Contents, so to speak, for the Environmental Impact Statement. That is, the listing of various sections of the Impact Statement, the order in which they should appear and the sort of subject matter that should be set out in them.

That, then, gives you a brief idea of what the Guidelines would consist of and how the Guidelines relate to this review that the Panel is conducting.

Because that is a very brief outline, perhaps I could invite anybody to ask a question, if they would like, about the review and about why the Panel is here and all that sort of thing before we go any farther. Would anybody like to ask a question?

MR. TOBY ANDERSEN: May I ask one question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. Would you come and use the microphone, please, and be kind enough to give us your name for the record?

MR. ANDERSEN: My name is Toby

Andersen.

The question I have, I do not suppose it is really directed to the Panel here but more to the federal government, I suppose, as a whole, the DND.

We have had military aircraft flying in Labrador for quite a few years. Why is the Panel set up now? I think maybe it is not too late and I suppose it is better than not at all, but I think it is a bit late when we have had the aircraft here for years.

Hopefully, something is going to come out of it but, as far as I am concerned, I think it is a bit late.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we appreciate your point of view, sir. There are others who have said much the same thing to us.

Perhaps the best explanation that I might be able to give at this point is that things have reached a point where the low level flight training has been carried on at a certain level, so to speak, a certain level of activity, I mean.

There is a proposal now to, not only carry on that activity, but perhaps to increase it through the involvement of additional NATO allies of Canada becoming involved in the process.

Besides that, of course, there is also a proposal to establish a training centre for NATO at Goose Bay.

All of that, I think, would represent a significant increase in the amount of activity. So, while it may not be an ideal situation, this is probably an appropriate point to stop a little and think about what is being proposed and think about what the impacts of that proposed activity might be.

Are there any other questions?

Very well, then, let us go on.

In order to make sure that the people of Makkovik and Postville understand exactly what is going on at Goose Bay, what has been going on and what is being proposed under the umbrella of this project that is under review now, we have invited here with us today a representative of the Department of National Defence who will make a brief presentation of what the project consists of and will then be ready to answer any questions about the nature of the project.

So I would like to introduce to you all Major David McCabe. If you are ready, Major, please make your presentation.

Thank you.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I gave a presentation this afternoon in somewhat more detail than I intend to do tonight in the interests of providing the maximum time to you.

I am going to try and summarize my presentation and, if you find that there are some areas that are a little sketchy and you want more clarification, please let me know after.

I have been working for the past two years in Ottawa, solely on Goose Bay, military plans for the future and also on the NATO project. So I am quite familiar with a lot of the details about it.

As you all know, Goose Bay has been associated with the military since it was built in 1941, with different levels of activity, of course.

Today, we have four countries represented in military presence in Goose Bay. Canada really does not do an awful lot of flying; they are more there in a support role for the long-range radar which has been there for many years, it is part of the air defence system. As well, they operate the air traffic control radar on the airfield.

Since March of this year, the Canadian Forces has established and is operating a station rescue flight consisting of three rescue helicopters which are there on a year-round, permanent basis.

Now, primarily, they are to support the military flying but they certainly are available to the civilian population and have been used in a number of rescue situations already.

The last thing that the Canadian Forces is involved in is the operation of the Military Co-ordination Centre which was established in 1984 to better control the activity that was going on in Goose Bay with respect to military flying.

The United States Air Force maintains a very small detachment, about 16 people, whose primary role is to service the large transport aircraft that come through to and from Europe and stop in Goose Bay to refuel.

The Royal Air Force of Great Britain has been in Goose Bay, actually, since the late 50s. But they have been increasing their activity since the late 70s with low level flying and, in 1980, the German Air Force commenced operations in Goose Bay doing similar kind of training.

Specifically, what they are doing is practicing low level flying for the purpose of successfully avoiding radar detection in time of hostilities and to do this, they have to be able to fly safely and effectively down to 100 feet with a number of aircraft.

They do this in two areas that are established for this purpose. I have those indicated on a map on the board which people can look at later, during a break, if they want. Those are existing areas which are used today.

They are used by the military but they

are not restricted to civilians. That is, civilians can fly through there or go in there to do whatever they want. So they are marked for the military pilots themselves.

That Military Co-ordination Centre I mentioned, one of their primary jobs is for the military users, like the British and Germans, they are the controllers, if you like, of the flight plans, the daily flight plans.

Each air crew must come in and file their route where they plan to go and they are informed of any local restrictions which might affect their flying that day. It is done on a daily basis.

Such restrictions as known concentrations of caribou, be it possibly in the calving period or in migrations, et cetera, these areas are marked on the maps and they are avoided by the pilots.

As well, any known locations of occupied hunting and fishing camps are marked on the maps that the air crew use with a little cirlcle, about five miles in diameter and they are to avoid those when they are flying low level. That is not to suggest that people will not hear the aircraft but they do avoid overflying them at low level.

Talking a bit about the future, the Allies, as the Chairman has mentioned, the current users -- and I should mention the four countries are all signatories to a multi-national agreement which runs for ten years and which, amongst several other things, covers really all their military activity in Goose Bay -- but particularly the Germans and British have indicated a desire to increase their activities somewhat,and by this I mean increasing the number of flights, possibly extending their training season which runs from about March to the beginning or middle of October.

As well, we have had interest shown by several other countries. Canada is currently negotiating with the Netherlands and it is hoped that the Royal Netherlands Air Force will commence a half-season training program next summer with about ten to 12 aircraft.

Part of the expansion, if you like, in this particular proposal, the expansion of the current operation, also involves the development or further development of practice weapons ranges. We have one in existence right now; it is about 65 miles south of Goose Bay -- I have that marked on the map as well -- and they have been looking for an area in the northern training area to establish a similar range.

These ranges, incidentally, are about eight miles in diameter and the one we have is located in an open, sandy area which has been burned out some time past by a forest fire.

The only kinds of weapons that are used on these are non-explosive, non-contaminant weapons. They are usually made of metal or concrete or plastic.

The other proposal that has been mentioned, and indeed, is probably referred to much more in the news, is the NATO tactical fighter weapons training centre. That is just a fancy name for an advanced flying school, if you like, for military pilots where they can practice and learn a variety of tactical techniques that they would have to use in time of war.

A lot of people have wondered why Labrador, why Canada, in fact.

Indeed, for the past five years that this program has been worked upon and studied and designed, if you like, as far as a general idea. The countries of Europe looked initially in Europe to establish such a centre, the main reason being, as you probably are well aware, the countries of Europe are extremely densely populated. There are an awful lot of military aircraft over there and the suitable training areas to do a variety of activities really are very few and far between.

So they were not able to find anything in continental Europe and they extended their search abroad.

Canada has offered Goose Bay and the

county of Turkey has offered Konya Air Base.

These two sites have been examined by a NATO working group and evaluated, and this working group has submitted a report recommending the most suitable site, in their opinion, to their NATO superiors.

NATO is expected to make a decision in December of this year on whether they accept the recommendation of the working group or if they wish to change it or whatever.

If it is accepted, then, the next and final stage, if you like, of this program will commence.

Over the next two years, following that December decision, NATO will sit down with the host country and carry out detailed planning and design of the centre, taking into account any limiting factors that might exist, such as information and recommendations that come from this study and other studies which are also being done.

They also will negotiate a long-term agreement for the centre.

It is expected this will take at least two years. The milestone, right now, for completion is December of 1988.

Should there be some kind of a major obstacle that is insurmountable during that period, such as negotiations or some major problem with the design, then NATO would, in all likelihood, turn to the other country that had been in the competition and will start all over again with negotiations and planning, et cetera.

If there are no major delays in this program, it is expected the NATO centre would be operational in the early 1990s.

One of the difficult things in talking about the NATO centre, and, in fact, in answering questions about it, is trying to have people understand that this NATO centre, although you may have heard a great deal about it in numbers and costs and all sorts of things, what we are talking about here is an idea, a proposal, a hypothetical model, if you like. It has not been designed for any specific location in mind. That comes later on, whichever place is chosen.

Because at the time they drew up the design of this thing, as far as what they envisage was required to satisfy all the training requirements, they were told at the time that cost was not to be a constraint in this thing. So they, basically, were given a free hand in what they thought would be required.

So what we have on paper is a very large scale, full scope facility which promises to handle a large number of aircraft and quite a variety of activities.

To give you a better idea of that, in its full scope, the centre would have up to 136 fighter-type aircraft, similar to the types used today in Goose Bay, flying up to 200 flights a day. The training would normally be in two-week cycles, running for about 20 weeks of the year. So we are looking at about a 40-week training period.

Every two weeks there would be about 1500 air crew and ground personnel rotating through Goose Bay from Europe, undergoing training. These people would be supported by an on-base staff, probably multi-national, of about 1700 people.

Now, because these people would be there for two or three years, it is expected that those that are married, of course, might well bring their families, further increasing the population by 1000 or 1500 people or so.

The initial establishment of this centre would require a great deal of construction, particularly if it goes to the full scope. We already see some expansion going on with the current operation.

Such things as married quarters, barracks for single personnel or for the transient personnel, recreational facilities, hangars, maintenance shops, even stores in the local community would be required.

As well, there would be upgrading of the current runway facilities, for example, the construction of a parallel runway.

The existing fuel supply system and distribution system which is already quite large but is rather dated, it would have to be upgraded considerably.

The types of activity that we would probably see, may see, because we do not really know, but again, that have been proposed for the NATO centre, would include the kind of activity done currently; that is, low level navigation and reconnaissance. There would also be medium to high level air combat training, as we call it, where aircraft practice fighting techniques and tactics against other aircraft.

That might involve supersonic flight in certain areas and might involve activity using techniques of electronic warfare, using on-board equipment, electronic equipment and ground-based electronic equipment.

There has been a desire expressed for a sea range, to call it a simple thing. It is basically an area where aircraft practice tactics against military shipping, that is, naval shipping.

From time to time, those areas are also used for target practice, in that a target towed by a ship is shot at, if you like, by aircraft.

Several such ranges already exist off the coasts of Canada and the United States. So it is not something that is a totally new idea.

There would be a requirement, again expressed in the ideal proposal, for as many as four practice weapons ranges, similar to that that we already have, with possibility of up to three live weapons ranges, which would probably be of a similar size, but using live conventional weapons.

Last would be a requirement for what we call flag-type exercises. That is a combination of all the other kinds of things that I mentioned where you have a large number of aircraft all doing different things in support of each other and, basically, at the same time. It is called flag-type exercise after two such exercises that are done, one in Canada in Cold Lake, Alberta, called Maple Flag, and Red Flag, done in Nevada in the States.

There is something I should mention. With respect to the live weapons ranges, when this initial idea was brought about and designed, if you like, in 1981, technology has advanced to the stage that there exists a system now -- the first system is running in United States -- where, through a computerized system, a simulated system, aircraft are able to carry out simulated attacks on targets on the ground and get a full scoring read-out, if you like, without any weapons coming off the aircraft. It is all done through simulation and electronics.

The obvious advantages to this system

which we call a no-drop bomb scoring system, are such things as protection of the environment because there are no bombs of any kind that hit the ground and also significant cost savings in weapons.

The last thing that I wanted to talk about that usually is of some interest or concern is the socio-economic aspects. Here, of course, I am talking basically about revenues that might come into the local communities or, indeed, the province or the country, for that matter and also employment opportunities.

Employment, as we see it, particularly with the NATO centre, would take place in two phases: that is, the initial construction phase which would probably be quite extensive in light of the things that I mentioned that would be required; and after that, on completion of the centre, there would be positions, of course, available for the ongoing regular operation of the centre, as any other airfield would require personnel.

Because this thing is only a proposal, everything we have looked at represents the full scale picture. Department of National Defence has been working on a study which is giving an idea of the numbers of jobs, types of jobs, the potential revenues that might be realized from this kind of activity coming into the area.

NOw, they have examined an expansion

of the current operation and also the NATO centre.

One of the things that one must point out here is that that does represent the full scale operation going in there. So, obviously, a lot of the statistics might be rather speculative. If a smaller scale operation goes in there, then, obviously, it would be directly proportional to the socio-economic benefits that would come to the area.

As the two year planning phase or design phase gets under way under the next couple of years, that is when we will start to obtain a clearer picture of what really lies ahead for military activity for Goose Bay.

It will be necessary, at that time, to really analyze, for example, where the money is going to come from for this centre, because, at present, that is not known.

I usually finish off by pointing out, and I think everyone is certainly aware, that Canada and all nations, indeed, are going through economic cutbacks and are taking a hard look at many programs and military programs, such as I have just been talking about briefly, are not exempt from these cutbacks. So it is when they sit down and do a realistic planning of this and finding out how much money nations are prepared to put into this that we will have a better idea.

So the NATO centre, particularly,

is something that has to be approached with caution.

That is all I really wanted to talk about. As I say, it is a much abbreviated version and I may have overlooked something. If people from this afternoon still have some concerns about other things I mentioned, please do not hesitate to speak up about it. I will take any questions about the proposals or, indeed, about other things related to Goose Bay that I might be able to answer for you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Before we hear the questions, I will mention something that I should have mentioned before, but forgot to.

We are providing interpretation here today from English to Inuktituk and vice versa. Our unseen interpreter is Mr. Sam Andersen who is working hard away in the next room. So, if anybody here would be more comfortable listening to and speaking to the meeting in Inuktituk, you have only to go to the side of the room next to the door and pick up one of these sets.

One other thing: We have been asked not to smoke in here. I have not seen anybody doing it yet, but I should have mentioned that earlier as well.

After the questions, I will call a short break in the meeting so that you can come up and look at the maps behind us here and, then, after that break, we will proceed to hear the presentations from the people of Makkovik and Postville who have indicated to us that they would like to speak here tonight.

So, if anyone has a question for the Major concerning the project, would you please make your way to the microphone standing in the middle of the room and please give us your name for our record and then proceed with your question.

Yes, sir?

MR/ GARY MITCHELL: I have a paper for the Panel. There is a number of questions on there.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are quite welcome to speak to us as well, if you wish. If you prefer not to, then we will be glad to accept your paper. The choice is up to you. Either way, your questions will go on the record on the public file.

So I leave the choice to you.

MR. MITCHELL: It is on behalf of the Community Council. So can I come up now?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I would like to hear questions about the project that you might like to ask to Major McCabe. Then you could come forward and present your questions, if you like.

Does anybody have a question about the project?

Yes, sir. Would you like to come to the microphone and ask your question?

MR. TOBY ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Toby Andersen again.

I have several questions here for, not only the Major, but the Panel, too, I guess, or the government, I should say.

But one of the questions that comes to my mind is: Is there a government hiring policy for this project as such? Because, through the media -- we watch television, we listen to radio, we get the news all the time -- and I understand that there is the possibility of nine civilian jobs at the weather station at Goose Bay being taken over by the military.

Now, if that is the federal government's hiring policy, in relationship to NATO, then we do not want it.

MAJOR McCABE: I am glad that you gave me an opportunity to talk on that because it is something that I do know a little bit about and, unfortunately, it is yet another of many things that is being misunderstood and understandably so, by the public.

The general policy, if you like, that certainly DND has, and as we are part of the government, I would assume it is an extension of that, is, and we have all heard of the federal and provincial politicians standing up and giving support publicly and internationally to the military expansion in Goose Bay, and their primary reason, if you like, or quoted, is the high unemployment in the area, the general socio-economic problems that exist throughout Labrador and Newfoundland which they see as a project of this size, hopefully, having some impact.

The idea is, obviously, to concentrate on local people, and by that, I am talking Labrador first.

So that is part of it.

Now, with specific reference to things like the weather office, the airfield which is currently operated by Transport Canada is being transferred to the Department of National Defence. If everything continues along as it is going right now, we should see that happen sometime next year.

Now, without giving out numbers and that, I can tell you that the way the military runs an operation, we have been able to assure Transport Canada that the positions which they have agreed and we are talking when we use the term "person years" here, but we are talking warm bodies as well, we have been able to confirm that people would maintain employment there. In some cases, some of the people may not maintain exactly the same job but we do not foresee layoffs and, in fact, we have identified a considerable number of extra positions that would be available because of the way we run things.

Now, some of those are hard military and they are positions that really do not exist right now. Some of them are what we call military/civilian which could be either type employed.

We do not have any more people available in the military that we can just arbitrarily bring in here. We would prefer to have local people employed.

Now, obviously, it depends on some of the kinds of specifics of the job required. The weather office, for example, it is my understanding that the current nine civilian positions will be transferred from the Department of Environment. The thing is, those people are not losing jobs; with the exception of one gentleman, I believe, they will be transferred elsewhere to continue the same kind of work.

In place of those nine, there will be 15 people moving into the area.

Now, the weather office, I suggest, is a bit of an exception.

There have been people talking about the fire hall, for example, as another area of concern, because there have been some changes in there already and the changes are, there are two fire halls there, there is a Public Works one which had in excess of 13 people on their payroll, if you like. Those people who would have been laid off have been in fact absorbed by the Department of National Defence into the Transport Canada fire hall.

The fire hall of 26 people has to be increased to 52 to meet the military requirements there.

Now, four or five of those 52 will be military. The rest of them will be civilians. We need to get those most likely from the local area because a lot of people have that experience from the previous days.

So, if you can understand my general comments there, the idea is to get local people as much as possible.

There are a lot of advantages to that. There are things like the security we can get with the knowledge that a person is going to want to stay in his job; rather than bringing in somebody from the outside who then gets dissatisfied and takes off, we have a guy who wants the job and is going to work at it. There are people, as we all know, that need it. So we are going to attempt, as much as possible, to use local employment.

That is maybe not all that you would like to hear in the way of assurances but it is about the best I can do.

What you hear on the media, I must suggest, is not always exactly the whole picture.

MR. ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a written presentation or anything. I did not call Goose Bay, as we were asked to do and find out if we could speak or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not absolutely necessary.

MR. ANDERSEN: But, as a concerned citizen, I have a few comments that I would like to make to the Panel. Would you allow me to do it? It would not take very long, about ten minutes, five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we certainly will have time to hear from you but I was wondering if, in fairness to the other people who did give us their names first, we would like to take the speakers in that order. You know, first come, first served, sort of thing, if that would be all right with you.

So we would hear from you just a little later on in the evening, if that would be acceptable to you?

MR. ANDERSEN: Oh, I will not be here very long.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well --

MR. ANDERSEN: I will be leaving in about 20 minutes, I guess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if we could just finish up first with any other questions about what the project is. If there are not any other questions of that sort, then we can proceed to hear the people from the community with their presentations and we could change the order a bit to put you on before you have to leave.

How does that sound?

MR. ANDERSEN: Yes, okay. Well, I will be leaving shortly but I will leave you with one thing, the final thing that I was going to say to the Panel.

You are talking about the Guidelines and my question would be: What powers does this Panel have?

Now, I understand you do not have the power to make recommendations to the federal government, saying that, okay, we can go ahead on a full scale NATO operation or you can say, we can go ahead, we have determined you can go ahead and set out a certain area, X number of aircraft, whatever, or the power to say, no, no military flying.

I would say to the Minister of DND that the people that you have on this Panel, I guess learned people is the name, but I would say the quality of the Panel that you have, I think you have travelled the coast, you have talked to people, you got a lot of information, I think, that this Panel should have the power to make a recommendation to government, whatever that recommendation might be, concerning the future of NATO in Labrador.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you for your suggestion, sir, and we will think hard about what to do about it.

There do not seem to be any other questions about the project, Major, so thank you very much.

I have been informed that the gentleman who spoke a little earlier is, in fact, one of the people on my list for speakers this evening and, in fact, he would be the first one that we would hear from.

So if we could take a short break now to give the interpreter a rest and to let you people have a chance to look at the maps up here, we will come back and we will hear, first, from the Community Council of Makkovik. A five or ten minute break.

Thank you very much.

---Short break

---Upon resuming at 8:15 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we get started, I would like to try to clear up what I believe may be a little misunderstanding that has been around.

We did publish an announcement saying that anyone who wanted to speak to the Panel should contact our office in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and put their name in.

Now, we did not intend that to mean that, if you did not put your name in, you could not come here tonight and speak.

Our purpose in asking people to register ahead of time was to try to find out roughly how many people would be coming so that we could plan the time of the meeting; if we were going to have two dozen speakers, it would make a lot of difference from if we were only going to have two or three.

So that is the only reason, to help us plan. We have no intention here, or anywhere else, of keeping people who wish to speak from actually getting up and speaking to us. We did not intend that at all and I am sorry if the announcement gave that impression.

So, along those lines, in speaking outside to Mr. Toby Andersen, we have found that he really would like to speak to us here this evening, so, with the kind co-operation of Mayor Mitchell, I am going to ask Mr. Andersen if he would like to come forward now and speak to us.

After that, we will hear from the Community Council.

Mr. Andersen, if you would like to sit at the table, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. TOBY ANDERSEN:

MR. TOBY ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mayor Mitchell

Toby Andersen, Sub.

for letting me speak first.

As I said, I do not have very much time. I have to go away in a few minutes.

I speak as a concerned citizen from Makkovik. I happen to be one of the land claims negotiators of the Labrador Inuit Association.

I do have some concerns about the project that I would like to outline to the Panel.

The first question I already asked was why the Panel was set up late. I was satisfied with the answer from the Chairman. I understand it fully.

The other question was to the Major. I was satisfied with the answer that I got.

But we were talking about jobs in the military and up here on the north coast. Personally, I do not see where there is going to be too many jobs for people here on the coast.

I can understand people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay supporting military activity. It is a military town; it was built by the military, for the military; it has survived on the military. All our projects were started in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and failed. So I can fully understand their full support for the military.

However, there are certain aspects that I think have to be looked into seriously, the

Toby Andersen, Sub.

major one being the environmental effects.

Some people say that a low level flying aircraft does not damage the environment, it does not hurt the wildlife. Other people say it does. So I think it is up to the federal government to determine exactly what the answer is: Does it or does it not?

We have the largest caribou herd in North America, shared with Quebec, and we do not want to see that go.

Our economy is based solely on fishery and trapping. We here in Northern Labrador are closer to the environment than anybody else, I think because we fish for a living, trap in the wintertime. That comes from the environment. If there are effects to the environment, we starve. So, to us, it is very, very important.

There may be some good aspects for military flying. We do not know. A federal government study or review should determine that and that study should be carried out very thoroughly.

There are aircraft flying around, there is a corridor set up that we saw on the map.

Now, what does the federal government have in mind for monitoring that corridor?

We would like to have that spelled out very clearly because up as late as May of this year we had low level aircraft that flew over our

Toby Andersen, Sub.

community, flew over Nain.

Now, that is not in the corridor.

We heard the Major a while ago say that there were certain spots pinpointed, if you want, on the map and the aircraft would not fly over those. They have already done it and the project is only a little itty-bitty yet. What about when it gets this big? How are you going to monitor that?

About the effects on wildlife. I do not know but I was one of the hunters from here about seven years ago, 1979. In late April, we went up here about, oh, I guess, 15, 16 miles, on Ski-doo out on the ice, the ocean, where the ice was broken at the edge of the ice, seal-hunting, and I may be mistaken, but I think it was British aircraft at the time. There were two jets that came over and they did that continuously for several days.

But the darn things come so low and they come so fast, you have no warning. You cannot see them; by the time you see them, they are gone in the distance and all you get is this big boom. You can feel the wind, they are that close.

Then you have your ears ringing for about at least 15 minutes. Your ears are just clouded up and just ringing.

That spring, not on the same day, but there were four different incidents where hunters from here found dead seagulls on the ice. We reported

Toby Andersen, Sub.

it to the military people in Goose Bay about seven years ago. We never, ever heard a word back. We thought it was from this big boom, you know. Just the shock. Maybe they were flying halfway between the ice and where the aircraft was and I do not know, the boom spit their brains out or something.

But that is what we think happened. Now, nobody has told us, I guess you call it a sonic boom, cannot do that. Nobody has told us that it can do that but these are the things that we have to find out.

In the review process and the Guidelines, I think one of the things that has to be taken into consideration before any decision is made is land claims.

The federal government are responsible for Aboriginal people of Canada and the federal government has recognized the Labrador Inuit Association as being an Aboriginal body. They have recognized them by consenting to a land claims negotiation with the federal and provincial government and the LIA is now in the process of proceeding with those negotiations.

We have made a claim to the land. As Aboriginal people, we are protected by the Canadian Constitution. Therefore, the land claims must be taken very seriously before this project goes into

Toby Andersen, Sub.

full operation. What do our people get out of it?

We have been called anti-development. We have been told to our faces right here in this community, but we are not.

Through a land claims negotiated settlement, we can have development, development that we have some control over. We have to have development more on a community concept where we are sure that the people who are going to benefit from any development in this area are the people that need it the most, the people right here, right at home, us, my sons and daughters, everybody else's sons and daughters and sons and daughters that are not born yet. That is the type of development that we have been asking for for years and years.

We believe the way to get that is through a land claims settlement. A project as big as the NATO project that is proposed has to take that land claims aspect into consideration before final approval.

We have watched quite closely on television and listened to the radio and followed this project to date quite closely and there was a big meeting in Goose Bay last spring sometime, I do not know exactly who was there or who was invited, nobody from here was invited. I think the Minister of DND was there. I know John Crosbie was there,

Toby Andersen, Sub.

The Honourable John Crosbie, the federal representative for this province, and Mr. Crosbie, in that meeting, said that a low level flying aircraft did not have any more effect or was no louder than a Ski-doo.

I do not know what kind of Mr. Crosbie has. He probably never, ever drove a Ski-doo, but, to us who have to take a Ski-doo from here, travel to Nain as far as 160 miles inland from Nain and bring back caribou from an Honourable Federal Minister, that is a slap in the face, because we depend on those machines and it is absolutely foolish to say that they are as loud as a low flying aircraft. It is crazy.

Mr. Crosbie, I know, is known for his little cracks in the House of Commons and everywhere else, but I think that is a foolish one.

I mean, the point is that, if that is the attitude that is going to be taken by honourable ministers of this country, Canada, then, you know, what are we talking about? Let us get serious.

I say to the Government of Canada: If you go ahead with the NATO project such as the one proposed, do not forget that we are here. We are little people but we are here, too.

We have laid a claim to part of this land and, if we are ignored, then the action starts because we are protected by the Canadian Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, the last part of what

Toby Andersen, Sub.

I was going to say I already said before and that is, I think that this Panel, the learned people, as I said, the quality of this Panel, should have more power than what has been given to them in determining whether or not the project goes ahead. I think the Panel should have enough power to be able to make a strong recommendation to the Minister responsible.

As I said before, maybe after your travels and all your information is collected, you can say, yes, there can be a project; maybe you can say that there can be military low level flying but at certain bases, up to a certain point; and maybe you say no, there should be none.

I think the Panel should have the power to be able to do that.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your time and once again, thank you, Gary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andersen. We appreciate that very much.

I hope that, if there are any others here who want to speak but who have not given their names yet, they will follow your example and make themselves known to us. We will put them on.

MAJOR McCABE: Just before Mr. Andersen goes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Major McCabe would like to say something about what Mr. Andersen has said.

MAJOR McCABE: I just wanted to say, Mr. Andersen, but also for the people here, I certainly appreciated your comments. In fact, maybe I have cut in on the Chairman's thunder but I was impressed by what you had to say.

I just wanted to comment on two things.

You mentioned those overflights in 1979. That is when low flying was just starting and it is because of things like that where people had a pretty free rein of where they went, that is why we came up with a need for that Military Co-ordination Centre that I mentioned we built a couple of years ago.

We do know that we have been able to reduce the number of occasions where there have been camps overflown or villages or whatever.

So that there is an improvement and it is that kind of thing that we are trying to reduce.

I do want to say, though, where you mentioned the two villages, well, here, I guess, and Nain, that have been overflown.

One of the things I left out in my summation there is that, although those areas are on the map, the aircraft can fly outside of those areas, they must file flight plans but they are supposed to maintain a higher altitude than the 100 feet they can fly in there.

So you will still see airplanes out

there but they have to follow the Canadian Civil Aviation Regulations, as any of the civilian plans do. So they can fly around as well, but they are supposed to respect certain altitudes.

Again, they are told that when they come over here to fly. So just to let you know that they are not doing anything illegal when they are flying out and looking at the communities and that, but what we try and tell me is to stay at a certain altitude or to stay off to the side of them.

If we still get low flights over communities, then we want to hear about it at the Co-ordination Centre, okay? Just to let you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

Now, as I said earlier, we intend to hear from speakers generally in the order in which we received their names, except, of course, that some of those people asked if they could be here this afternoon and we have heard from most of them.

So I propose to hear, first, from the Community Council; then, from another resident of Makkovik who intended to come here this afternoon but was unable to; then, to hear from some people from Postville who wish to speak; then, continue with the other speakers from Makkovik; and, finally, to hear from a person from Nain who wishes to speak on behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association.

If that sounds like a reasonable

procedure, we will go on with that. I will ask Mr. Gary Mitchell, the Mayor, to come forward now and make his presentation.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. GARY MITCHELL:

MR. GARY MITCHELL: Okay.

I would like to thank the Panel on behalf of the Community Council and the Community of Makkovik, for that matter, for choosing the community as a place of call whereby we can have some participation and give our opinions in the Environmental Review process.

The format of this presentation that we are making on behalf of the Council may not follow in order with the proper procedures. One reason is that we do not have the services of an official secretariat to put together our papers, as in the case of most government agencies.

The second reason is that we understood these meetings are intended to be informal and that is why you will notice that the topics in this paper are juggled around a bit, with no lengthy write-up on any one concern that we have identified.

Informal as they may be, we still demand a response from each concern that we are putting to the Panel.

It seems that enough concerns have been listed over the past few months. Now it is time we focus in on the objectives and have a true analysis

Mitchell, Sub.

of what exactly will be a tactical fighter weapons training centre.

We understand that low level flying is carried out as a bilateral agreement between the federal government of Canada and certain NATO countries. Is this bilateral agreement also to look after the ecosystem?

Surely, since the NATO countries that have been using Goose Bay since 1980 for low level training, they must have put some input into organizing and conducting ecological impact studies to some extent.

How can the CAF monitor their activities outside of Goose Bay when they do not have the equipment to work or fly with?

It does not make sense that the CAF can do monitoring without being biased. After all, it is the DND who are encouraging NATO to operate here.

At what point will CAF tell NATO that they are out of order?

Another thing that the public should be told is, if we, the taxpayers, are paying to have NATO training flights monitored, is the federal government being compensated for all the added duties of search and rescue or millions of dollars spent in studies and Panels to assess the activities and

Mitchell, Sub.

effects of low level flying?

The Canadian Public Health Association has been putting together its final draft on psychological and social effects that low level flying would have on us and our health.

Why were we not given any opportunity to have input into that report?

We live only minutes away from the base, by air, of course, and we consider ourselves to be in the project area but we have had no consultation and is that so strange?

Why could the two reports not, the Environmental Impact Study and the Health Report, be done together?

Environment and health have common characteristics to some extent. Again, we are seeing funds squandered by both levels of government.

In regard to the environment, how well can these untrained pilots be disciplined? Will our land and wildlife be abused?

To quote an officer from CAF this past summer to whom I was talking, after there was a report of low level jet coming out over the area: "There are a couple of yah-hoos in every bunch."

With the increased military activity, the number of these yah-hoos will increase.

Soldiers from another country will not be the ideal conservationists as we want them

Mitchell, Sub.

to be. They will not have any use for the land, except for target ranges and not having to live with the aftermath of a deserted, target-torn land.

Compensation for disturbance fees in the area which is being used for these exercises should be considered and discussed at future meetings. These fees should be discussed between the federal government and its parties, presumably the NATO allies who are in a bilateral agreement with each other.

These parties are already stepping on the doorstep of our land base. These parties do not even bother to knock; they just come roaring in at 100 feet above the ground and we are silenced by the noise they leave behind.

If there are not enough safeguards in place, they will have come and gone away again; the damage will have been done and along comes more Panels and Commissions from the government to make more assessments.

The federal government is in a position and has a duty and a mandate to regulate and monitor the daily activities of low level flying in a manner that will not upset or hinder the wellbeing of every man, woman or child in Labrador.

In an article in the Globe and Mail on October 25th, 1985, it stated that all civilian air traffic would be controlled by the military. Think of the adverse effects on our schedules and

Mitchell, Sub.

livelihood. We can anticipate flight delays, tedious security checks and extra expense due to delays. I am talking about at the airport in Goose Bay. We will lose our identity and lifestyle as all our comings and goings will be hinged on the military. Maybe a new airport should be built for civilian travel.

Am I reading this too fast? I am all wound up here. If you can keep up with a low level jet, you can keep up with my reading.

Jobs: In the Royal Commission's recently published report on employment and unemployment, they recommended that training programs for Native people be set up.

Will there be consideration given to train people for jobs on a proposed NATO base to give them an opportunity to make use of employment opportunities?

Just how many jobs will actually be available for civilian workers?

In a recent radio report from CBC, there is already talk of weather office jobs going and they will be instead filled by the military. This could be an example of how the process will work on a NATO base. Military jobs for military operations.

What about spinoff jobs? Can there be spinoff jobs from such a development?

Military services should utilize

Mitchell, Sub.

Labrador resources, such as fish, caribou and seal.

Labrador fishermen need new markets and having the military using these products would be a boost for our own local economy.

On page 17 of the Draft Guidelines, various developments are mentioned. Why is the fishery not mentioned?

It is our backbone industry and on the upswing in development.

Why did the Panel choose to fail to mention this important resource? Is government concentrating more on our development and neglecting the fishery industry?

Maybe arrangements can be made with NATO countries to offer better prices for our fish in return for the use of our homeland resources.

The federal government should have been concerned with environmental impacts since low level flying began in 1980. Six years have gone by and the government is only now gathering information and concerns on whether low level flying by the military is good or bad for the area.

We know that government processes are slow, but this one takes the cake.

On the Journal, CBC television, on October 22, 1986, they featured low level flying, training and flying in Goose Bay. From point of

Mitchell, Sub.

view, CBC did their best to avoid the real issues and concentrated more on campfires on the beach at Sheshatshit, a night at the local tavern in Happy Valley and what seemed to be a very uncomfortable setting between the Innu and business people in a bedroom at the Labrador Inn.

They made it seem like only the Innu are causing all the fuss about not wanting NATO on their land.

We are not fighting for our land but we have to have our concerns addressed and ensure that we will have the maximum protection for our people and resources.

Health services: With increased military activities, thereby controlling civilian aircraft, our health standards will be affected immensely.

We rely on outside facilities and to come and go only when we are permitted will be a step backwards, thereby creating problems in the delivery of health services on the coast.

Also, with more people in Goose Bay, this will increase the workload for personnel at the hospital and, thereby, create a great need for expansion of their facilities.

Much consideration must be given to how services will be affected and carried out without

Mitchell, Sub.

prejudice or neglect.

Land claims: On page 40 in the Draft Guidelines, it states that it has no mandate to deal with the subject of land claims policy.

We realize that this is a very complex issue; however, the Panel should be aware of what progress has been made and the scope of the land claims negotiations. We feel that the Panel should be familiar with this issue as this process could be leading up to a new revolution in Labrador.

In Ottawa, this coming spring of 1987, there will be a First Ministers' Conference held with all Native groups in Canada to discuss Aboriginal rights.

One of the main issues will be self-government.

At this historic meeting, self-government may be amended into the Constitution, thereby giving Native people more control of their own affairs and, in some cases, including having their own jurisdiction of land bases.

Where does this fit in with the plans of the military?

We know we cannot stop it but there must be some consideration given, especially if the federal government grants us that element, thereby giving us more control and jurisdiction over our land

Mitchell, Sub.

resources and fiscal arrangements.

We are not in a position to give an account of land claims negotiations as that can be obtained from the Labrador Inuit Association of which we are members.

We are not stating our position on the NATO base at this time. More data must be collected and passed on to us before we weigh the benefits against the adverse effects of the operation.

For the record, we do not like the idea of Garfield Warren, our MHA, telling the House of Assembly that his district supports the base or Steve Michelin, the president of Combined Councils of Labrador stating that all the Combined Councils favour the NATO base.

We feel that it is up to each individual themselves to pass judgment on whether they favour NATO or not. We do not want any group or persons using us, meaning the community, for support when we have not given our consent to do so.

I would like to add that I was quite disappointed to hear on CBC Radio on October 20th, 1986, that the Quebec government was displeased with the federal government and the Panel for various reasons.

Why could any other group or person not get their opinions or their concerns on the news?

Mitchell, Sub.

CBC could do well to follow and broadcast all meetings or concerns.

What do people in Montreal have to shout about? This is, I guess, where the newscast came from over the displeasure. They have more noise and pollution there than they will ever get from low level flying jets in Labrador, which is where all the action is.

I think that sums up the presentation that we had to make here tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Mitchell.

If I may, I would just like to comment very briefly on one point that you raised concerning the fact that the Guidelines on page 17 do not mention the fishery.

I do not think anyone in this room or anywhere else would argue against the importance of the fishery in this area but what we were attempting to do in that section of the Guidelines was to draw attention to other development projects that may be going on now or may be coming in the near future, which could, in themselves, have effects on the environment and which might combine with this project that we are reviewing here now and together, cause greater effects than either this project or the other ones separately.

Mitchell, Sub.

So I do not think it would have been appropriate to include the fishery in that list, because that would be implying that the fishery itself would have effects on the environment. So I believe that should explain why we did not mention the fishery.

MR. MITCHELL: The reason why I put it in was because all these projects are mentioned, future projects and development, and we think that the fishery should be developed even more. So that is why I think any development that you are talking about should also include the fishery as it is, not leave it as it is, but look for development and include it with all future developments.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will take note of your comment and think hard about that, then.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you again.

Major McCabe, I will give you a brief moment to make a response. We have other speakers we would like to hear from.

MAJOR McCABE: I appreciate the other speakers, sir. It is important for the record that I do address, particularly from the Town Council's presentation, a couple of things and they will be mostly one-liners.

I think you mentioned untrained pilots, how would they be disciplined.

Mitchell, Sub.

When I mentioned a training school, it is not to train untrained pilots. These people are extremely advanced and have been flying for years, the majority of them. They are highly disciplined.

If I misheard you there...

Okay, I will continue on. The statement about these people not being concerned about the environment, Europeans, because of the dense area they live in, are extremely conscious of environment and animals and trees, and I can assure you, I already know of their wonderment at the environment here and they do very much respect it and, hopefully, will continue that way.

That statement in the Globe and Mail about the civil air traffic. That is a very important one to get straight here.

Air traffic control will be taken over by the military. It used to be run by the military. I was a controller myself at Goose Bay for two years back in the early 70s. We ran a 24-hour operation, then. They run a 16 right now. We are going back to 24 hour operation. That is better for the air traffic control.

There is going to be no priorities or anything else getting into air traffic. The establishment, for example, of that station rescue I mentioned, two weeks after the thing was into Goose

Bay, they went out to an accident with Lab Air and managed to save one guy's life.

If that unit had not been there, those guys all probably would have died.

There are improvements coming with that military thing.

Last of all, there is a new radar which is being put in, air traffic control radar, to replace the antiquated system there. That is going in this fall which will provide much safer air traffic control for all aviation.

So that point in the Globe and Mail really was taken wrong because the air traffic will improve, I can assure you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major.

MR. MITCHELL: Will I be able to respond to that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, of course, come ahead.

MR. MITCHELL: Do I have to go to the mike?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, yes, in order to get on the record, you will have to go to one of the microphones, please.

MR. MITCHELL: Concerning the untrained pilots, I did not mean that they were untrained in the way that they did not know how to

Mitchell, Sub.

fly.

I was going with the meaning that they must be untrained to come here to do some training here in low level flying in Labrador.

So, if they come here to do training, they must be untrained.

That is just my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Now, Mr. William Andersen, Senior, was hoping to get here this afternoon to speak to us. For various reasons, he was not able to do so, but he is here now, so I would ask him to come forward now and speak to us, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN, SENIOR:

MR. WILLIAM ANDERSEN, SENIOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do not have very much to say, but there are a few things that have bothered me.

This low level flying that has been going on for the past five or six years have not been of too great a concern to me because we have never heard of anything shown over the land so far that have been affected by this.

There has been a lot of talk about caribou herds and I do not think that this amount of flying, the noise level, at least, have not affected these animals too much.

Wm Andersen, Sr., Sub.

But we do not only think of caribou when we are thinking of the environment.

I think the fumes from these large planes flying at 100 feet continuously, day after day, must drop an awful lot of things that could hurt the whole environment, small birds, plants, dropping into lakes, contaminating water.

The thing that scares me most is when they talk of target practice. If that does not come, even, with the low level flying, if that NATO base starts, for them, sure, they are going to have target practice. I understand, I have heard, in a roundabout way, that they are going to use the sea as well as the land for this target practice.

As you have heard here tonight, these communities along the coast depend almost solely for their income from the fishery. If there is live ammunition dropped in the sea along with the big draggers that are out there, there were enough complaints about that, if you start dropping live ammunition out in that sea and there will be nothing left for these people to survive on.

Do you think a NATO base will ever provide the work for all these people along the coast?

There is one more thing that I would like to say in conclusion. I think the government should have given much more thought to the Native

Wm. Andersen, Sr., Sub.

land claims before they ever allowed low level flying even to come to Labrador because, as has been stated by people all along this north coast, the Native people do have a right to a lot of this land.

Now that they have had already six years of low level flying and they intend to extend this and bring other countries in and more planes, what will happen to Labrador?

We know that, in the future, down the line, I will not live to see it and maybe people of your age will not live to see it, but some of the younger people are going to see that Labrador will become a lot more like places outside. It will be developed and it will be used but why destroy it in such a way as this just to give people from the European countries a chance to train for war purposes?

Thank you very much, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andersen.

Next, as I promised a few minutes ago, we would like to hear from several persons from Postville who have come over here at our invitation to speak to the Panel.

You may come forward individually or all together as a group, if you like, and sit around the table. Or, if you prefer, you could use that microphone on the floor, one by one. So we give you your choice. Make yourselves comfortable at either place and take whatever time you need to make your point to the Panel.

MS JANET PILGRIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: May we have your name, please.

---SUBMISSION BY MS JANET PILGRIM:

MS PILGRIM: I am Janet Pilgrim from Postville. I am representing the Postville Health Committee.

I guess a lot of concerns we have in Postville regarding the Health Committee, like our group, are much the same concerns as you have heard everywhere, but I think it is very important that we give our opinions on how we feel and what our concerns are.

We are much concerned about the NATO training base and the low level flying, what impact those planes will have on our people and our wildlife, such as caribou and fur-bearing animals and also the birds and the fish.

Also, we are concerned about tourism. Somebody I noticed today already mentioned something about tourism, how people come from outside to our land, come to Labrador, come down here to see this untouched country, the beautiful Labrador coast.

I think it is very important that

Pilgrim, Sub.

it stay that way.

If the NATO base goes ahead, what gains will our coast have, the people of our communities, Postville, Makkovik as well and the rest of the communities along the coast.

What will they gain from this thing? Will they gain anything or will they lose everything and not have anything at all, just leave a spoiled land?

What social impact will it have on our people, young and old alike?

We are also much concerned about the health and sound impacts from those low level planes. What sort of impact will it have on our people, on their hearing?

Someone already mentioned how deafening and frightening it can be. So we wonder what it is going to be like.

We are very much concerned about those things as a group. I am not speaking for all of our community because we have not talked to everybody but this is just our concerns, mine and the rest of our health committee.

I think it is very important that we keep our land as it is.

This low level training thing, I think -- I do not know really how to say it -- but I do

Pilgrim, Sub.

not think it is very good for our coastal communities.

Just the last part of August, we had two planes flying much lower to Post Hill. Post Hill is 475 feet and he came in no more than about three or four hundred feet, I guess, between Postville and the Hill. I do not think that is very good.

I do not have anything else to say but I can tell you I am not for this thing.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Would the next speaker from Postville come forward whenever you are ready and speak to us?

---SUBMISSION BY MS PEGGY EDMUNDS:

MS PEGGY EDMUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Peggy Edmunds and I am here to represent the Postville Women's Group.

The same as other different groups that are here, we would like to know more about what is going to happen to us if there is a NATO base at Goose Bay.

We would like to know how it would affect our lives and also know how it would help us prosper, or if there is any prosperity for us.

The Natives of the affected area claim that it would spoil the environment in which their daily lives are involved. We also have our children's lives and their futures to think about.

As was already mentioned tonight, the remark that John Crosbie made about the noise of the jets, he said that they are not much louder than a Ski-doo. We do disagree with this, of course, and maybe if the Honourable John Crosbie came to live down here, he would change his mind about this also.

We do support the Natives in our group. We plan to do this. We do not agree with NATO at all.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I believe we have one more speaker from Postville, is that right?

---SUBMISSION BY MORRIS JACQUE:

MR. MAURICE JACQUE: My name is Morris Jacque, and I am representing the Community Council of Postville.

Most of the concerns and questions that I had prepared have been asked and some of them have been answered but one of the questions we had prepared was that a few years ago, a company called Brinex held a hearing in Postville and, as far as we could understand, after the hearings were over, the government said that they will be going ahead with the project no matter what the concerns of the

Jacque, Sub.

people were.

I was wondering: Will this hearing turn out the same way?

Because it seems like the people coming into Labrador from other places neglect the rights of the people of Labrador.

I am a native of Labrador and I hunt and trap this country for a living. I fish in the summer and trap and kill birds and what-not for a living to eat because not all the time as a fisherman, the income is enough to provide and buy stuff from a store, because it is awfully expensive.

That is why I depend on the land for a living. Not only land, I use the timber also to make things to help get along and make money.

I am very, very much opposed to this NATO base that is about to be started up in Goose Bay.

I would like to know, also, this evening if there is anybody here representing LIA. I would like to ask the question to Sharon about the involvement of the LIA.

Why did it take so long for the Labrador Inuit Association to have anything to say?

Watching television and listening to the news on the radio, it seems like there have been only Innu speaking against this NATO base that

Jacque, Sub.

is about to go into Goose Bay.

I would like to get an answer, a definite answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if Sharon Edmunds would care to make any reply to that right now.

MS SHARON EDMUNDS: Sharon Edmunds.

I would just like to briefly respond to the question.

LIA has been expressing its concerns to the Department of National Defence for the last six years.

We have a different approach than other groups in dealing with low level flying and the possible establishment of a NATO base.

LIA will be sending a copy of its presentation to the Community Council in Postville for public viewing by individuals in the community.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Does that complete the list of speakers from Postville?

Fine. Thank you very much.

Next, we will hear from Mr. Ted Andersen of Makkovik.

Mr. Andersen?

---SUBMISSION BY MR. TED ANDERSEN:

MR. TED ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ted Andersen, Sub.

My name is Ted Andersen. I have a few things here on paper but, before I get to that, you know, this must be and has to be history. Where else in the world will you see a couple of thousand people telling its military people what they can do and what they cannot do?

They are, to me, the police force, not in such that they come around, I suppose, until now, but they do, especially NATO, their task is to try and balance the powerful nations, big bad Russia over there and big, good America over on this side of us, our next door neighbour. Both of them are really our neighbours because you just go over the Pole and they are our neighbours of the north.

But, anyway, I see that my main concern here tonight will be the Panel and its future role; but, anyway, to get down to what I have to say here.

It has been said that there is friction, even the word "animosity" has been used, that is between the people who support the military build-up and the people opposing it.

Now, just for a second, when I say this, I am not too worried about this NATO thing right now because my main concern right now is the build-up in Goose as it is today.

The Dutch Air Force is about to move in. I believe the Belgians are taking a look. Who

Ted Andersen, Sub.

next? The Italians? Name them.

Anyway, I would say that in five years, and it will probably be only about five years' time, that this NATO thing is going to come into being and, as the Major said earlier, there are a few pennies involved here. It is going to take money and we have most of the facilities in place and you are welcome, come on, boys. The Canadian government will give you this for next to nothing.

We have a piece of land up there and there are a couple of thousand people up there but, come on, boys.

One of the Ministers from out west said the other day that, if low level flying does not harm you, why do you not fly over Toronto or Montreal someplace?

Well, you know very well they are not going to drop a chunk of cement in downtown Toronto or Montreal.

So we have a space out there, we have a big back yard out there, it is quite big.

Anyway, down to the more serious part of it.

I love a good quote. I guess most people do and I have one here. It is namely for the people who oppose the training centre at Goose Bay. I guess the fellows who are in support of it,

Ted Andersen, Sub.

they will use it, too, but it gives both parties a right.

It was written during the Second World War by a person in a Nazi prison camp.

> "First, they arrested the Communist but I was not a Communist, so I did nothing. Then they came for the Social Democrat but I was not a Social Democrat, so I did nothing. Then they arrested the trade unionist but I was not a trade unionist, so I did nothing. Then they came for the Jews and the Catholics. I was not a Jew or a Catholic; I did nothing. At last, they came and arrested me and there was no one left to do anything about it."

I think, whether we are pro or whether we are against, but I would say that this is mainly for the people who are against. We have a right and, therefore, it is just like this guy who was in the prison camp. We are here, anyway.

I believe that we should question any sort of development. You will notice that I say "development." To me, a build-up of a military base is not development. It is something that the powers that be put into place because they are to

Ted Andersen, Sub.

protect you.

What does concern me is the bombing range, as we have heard it here from the Council, from our Mayor and from Mr. Andersen and from the people in Postville, and, pardon me, the two Mr. Andersens and the people from Postville.

But, to me, one of the most important parts of all of this is there has been little or nothing said about what is going to happen to this Panel after this has all been said and done.

Let us go back to the early part of the 70s for a minute.

East-Can found natural gas off the Labrador coast, so we went off to St. John's, several people went from St. John's from time to time. Then they formed an oil and gas committee.

East-Can went and so did the oil and gas committee.

You will remember, Dr. Barnes, the Brinex development? You were on that Panel or whatever, you know. So the price of uranium or pitchblend, whatever you want to call it went out and so did our committee and everything else.

Our government did not see fit to fund such a Panel or committee or whatever to document everything and keep things in order. So now we have a Panel for low level flying, another big flap

Ted Andersen, Sub.

in the pan come up here. So we have to get a bunch of boys together and see how the people feel about it.

It does not matter, I do not think, if we want this training centre or we do not want it. This is the military we are talking about here. It is not East-Can, PetroCan, Brinco or whatever. This is the military.

They are the boys and the girls who defend our democracy and, as some people like to put it, they even defend our faith. They will use anything that we have to achieve these goals. They have to, because they are the defenders of the country.

So what will happen to this committee after they have done this job, the work of these people? Will their words or whatever be lost in the sounds of fighter jets taking off out of Goose Bay? You will not hear anything more about it? Will it gather dust on shelves or whatever?

Let us hope that the government will see fit to fund this Panel or a Panel as such for a number of years to come so that, if again something comes up, you know, we have heard people say: Why was LIA not doing this before? Why was there something not done on low level flying before? I am sure wherever you went you heard the same story.

I do not think that we are asking

Ted Andersen, Sub.

too much. I think that that would be tax dollars well spent.

Maybe the NATO bunch that is in Goose right now could help fund such a Panel. At least the Native people would be getting something in return for the use of their land. But there is no question, there is no dispute about the land.

There were people here when the Europeans came and that answers any question. The court will decide but that is the 1980s or whenever, that is just their opinion.

The Panel could look at -- do not get me wrong, I am not backing the military in any way, any shape or form -- it is just that I believe that this is a foregone conclusion, it is only a matter of time, but with a Panel in place, that operation down there in Goose Bay right now, they could monitor that, see for every tree that this company has taken, is there a plan for reforestation of any kind which takes many, many years to grow here in Labrador or are we just going to see a wasteland where they came in and cut the trees and then took their money and left?

That is usually what happens. We want to make sure that that does not happen. Government is not going to do it.

Take a look at what is being done

Ted Andersen, Sub.

in the name of tourism.

People on the coast here do not benefit at all from tourism. Maybe they do buy the odd craft made in Labrador but, outside of that, very little.

Let us take a look at the mining operation that is going on up there near Nain, that Labradorite thing. With our good intentions, we should make sure that we do not make any mistakes there.

It is fine to criticize East-Can, Brinco, military or whatever, but we, too, have to take care of our resources.

When we say, this is ours, we have to look after it because, once it is gone, our children will never, ever get anything back, because growth and everything is so slow.

So we have to make sure that everything for Labrador is well protected.

Let us take a look for a second at what the Panel could do for the fishery. Maybe with different species and finding of better markets or whatever, our fishermen can make a better summer.

I am self-employed but a lot of my work depends on the fishermen. If they make a good summer or a couple of good summers, that means that I can go and hire on a couple of more men to go and

Ted Andersen, Sub.

do some work. So the whole thing is a chain there.

You know, maybe they can get more salmon or a better price for their salmon so they will not have to deplete the salmon or char stocks that are around.

Now, many people are going to say, those are federal and provincial fisheries line of work. But, you know, our politicians, especially our ministers, they love to fish our lakes and rivers so much that you get a warden or a fishery officer on there, if he has got to go and tell his boss: Well, look, you cannot do this, you cannot do that, you cannot do something else, he will soon find himself without a job.

The other day, when they were roasting John Crosbie, Frank Moores was in on it and Crosbie went back at Frank Moores and he said that Frank Moores when he was the Premier of the province, he spent so much time on the salmon rivers, that he figured in the fall he would spawn.

Well, I think that all the politicians should be spawning by this time.

I would like to see something like this , and I am sure that, then, you would get the co-operation of the people more than ever. There would be a learning process on both sides and I see a lot that can be done.

Ted Andersen, Sub.

When, at this training centre, where it is in Goose Bay right now, the NATO people that come in there, they go fishing, they fish our rivers, lakes and ponds. You would need a crowd like this to tell us what is going on there. Is this going back to Bonn or to wherever? Or back to parts of England?

We cannot go out as Natives and get fresh trout whenever we need it. We can only have our nets in Makkovik Bay here up until the time that the fish plant opens up. Then, any person who happened to hold a permanent job here, tough luck, buddy. You are working, so you cannot get a license and if you get a salmon, or a salmon happens to get in your net, buddy, you got to put him back whether he is dead or alive.

So, here, how do we go about getting back at government?

Now, let us take servicemen fishing the rivers. They can land any place they want because they have access to the Royal Canadian Search and Rescue, which is all the same thing. So what do they do; they use our search and rescue helicopters to go and fish our rivers. So who is paying for the search and rescue helicopter? The Canadian taxpayer. So what we are doing, come in boys, you know. Use our helicopter and go and fish our rivers

Ted Andersen, Sub.

but make sure that the Natives do not do it. We will get them for you. We will keep this for you. That is your right.

So, in closing, sir, I would like to say that I certainly hope -- and maybe this has come to you before -- but we certainly hope that it will be one of the top priorities on your Guidelines or whatever you are looking for, that something like this will be in place, whether it is in four or five years down the road that the price of uranium goes up and Brinco comes back, that we will not, in a hurry, try to get a Panel together to see what the heck is going on here and that the military will be able to tell us -- they will not give any top secrets or anything but they could let us know -- what is going on from time to time.

Back to the low level flying for just one second, there is a little story I would like to tell you before I go.

In 1977, it is a beautiful afternoon, very little wind and there were four or five of us that were on a little fishing trip, coming down the Makkovik River. It is just a little tiny river; there is salmon, sea-run trout, beautiful afternoon and we were fishing away, getting pretty well down to the mouth of the river, when all of a sudden this aircraft comes out, just like that RAF thing, the

Ted Andersen, Sub.

Falcon, or whatever she is.

Major, have you seen one of them coming down when you are on a river where there is not a breath of wind and you see them just over the treetops? Did you ever see the tree move? You have to do this. If I would have had a rifle, as much as I like RAF, I would have liked to see whether my bullet could catch his tailpipe or not.

But, anyway, so he passed and, you know, the boom and right behind it came the second guy and there was a big black smoke when he started to go up.

I am sure that there has to be some sort of a fallout or a waste of some sort from this aircraft.

Now, I know that we, too, use aircraft because that is our only way of transportation 12 months of the year. I suppose they, too, have their little smoke or whatever.

I did mention this aircraft to a person in Goose and he said: Well, Ted, why did you not get a number off of it? I said: Well, have you ever tried to get the number off of a twin Otter when she flies overhead? Take one of those, I do not know what they fly at, but, anyway, we certainly hope that there will be a Panel in place for many years to come and that we do not have one just when there is a flash in the pan or whatever.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Andersen.

I believe what you are asking for is good, long-term planning for beneficial resource development.

I rather doubt that this Panel can solve all the problems of Labrador but we will do our best to pay attention to your recommendations and do what we can within the job that we have been given to do.

MR. ANDERSEN: Can I respond to that, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ANDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, there is no way that any Panel can solve all our problems but I believe and I know you from back in the Brinex days when we were doing that environmental assessment there, and I think that both of us have mellowed some but I am sure that, with you there, I think that, if it was possible, that there is a lot of questions that would be answered.

I think the main thing that the people are looking for is to be kept informed on the goings-on of whatever it may be.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. We will do our best.

We have two other speakers on the list and there may be another person who would like to speak after that.

Just at the moment, I have been advised that our hard-working interpreter is about to run out of breath if we do not give him a short break.

So we will take a break of five minutes or so and then come back and hear the remainder of the speakers.

Thank you very much.

---Short recess

---Upon resuming at 9:45 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I believe we are ready to begin the final part of tonight's meeting.

Our next speaker will be Miss Violet Ford. If she is ready, I would ask her to come forward, please. Would you like to sit at the table and be more comfortable?

MS VIOLET FORD: No, I would rather be here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Your choice.

---SUBMISSION BY MS VIOLET FORD:

MS FORD: I would like to address

Ford, Sub.

the Panel with regard to the project that is planned for the future and to emphasize that the area is our property. It is our property even if that case was taken to court under the Aboriginal rights, I would think, and it is being interfered with now and it will be interfered with in the future.

REPORTER: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. There is no sound. I cannot hear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, it must be a problem. If you would bear with us for a moment.

MS FORD: It is with regard to our property, northern Labrador.

The reason it is our property is because we have used it and we have occupied it for hundreds of years.

It is a thing that should be stressed by the Panel and should not be overlooked as a minor thing.

Anywhere else in Canada, if this kind of thing were planned, there would be a hell of a lot more stink kicked up than is being kicked up now and the government, I am sure, would not be able to get away with it even as far as they are now in the plans.

In order to understand the property concepts of any society, one must have some appreciation of the overall philosophy or habitual thought of that

Ford, Sub.

society and we, as people in northern Labrador, we look at the land as the way it is used for the benefit of all who occupy it. We see it as ours and we are concerned over the way it is being used.

As you might be aware, in order to prove that we have Aboriginal title or right to this land, we must prove certain elements.

Number one, that we or our ancestors were members of an organized society.

Number two, that the members of the society occupied it, based on anthropological and archaeological evidence which shows that we had and we continue to do so.

Number hree, that our ancestors occupied the land at the time England had sovereignty over us. I think at some point England had sovereignty over Labrador.

There are two questions I would like to see dealt with by the Panel or make it part of their Guidelines or whatever.

Specifically, I would like to see what is the present legislation that permits the military to carry out the present activities and future plans of low level military flying over Labrador, specifically?

Number two, we know we have rights here, Aboriginal rights but, at the present, within

Ford, Sub.

the legal system, if we decided to oppose these activities from continuing, what way would we challenge it?

I think that would be helpful for us to see both sides.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Now, that concludes the list of speakers from Makkovik and Postville who advised us that they would like to speak.

As I said earlier, before we would invite a speaker from outside the community to speak, we would want to make sure that everybody from within the community who wished to had the opportunity. So would somebody else like to speak at this time?

MR. RUPERT McNEILL, JUNIOR: Yes, sir, I would.

My name is Rupert McNeill, Junior, and I was born and raised here. Presently, I am living away from home. I have lived in Ontario for seven years.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. RUPERT McNEILL, JUNIOR:

MR. McNEILL: Talking about the environmental studies, I hope when the study is done it will be not just a whole bunch of mumbo-jumbo, that there will be proper examples given and will be clearly communicated to the people.

R. McNeill, Jr., Sub.

For instance, take some of these aircraft. If some of these jets should fly over caribou somewhere, somewhere away from where people are hunting them and see what the effect is on the caribou.

Where did they go? Look at where they are grazing in Labrador now, and where would they go if they would go somewhere?

If you drove them from where they are now, where are they going to go?

Surely to goodness, if there is nothing to feed on somewhere else, they are not going to go far. So, even if jets go over and frighten the caribou, maybe they will just get frightened for a while and eventually go back to the grazing where they already are. These type of things.

The other thing I would like to mention is about the sonic booms from the jets.

In Ontario, they have a Canadian National Exhibition down on the shoreline of Lake Ontario which is at the edge of Toronto. They put on a big air show there every year.

I was there about six years ago and the jets flew a little out of their planned path and they came along by the tall skyscrapers, and they slapped all the glass out of the side of them, the vibrations were so great.

Another thing I would like to mention

R. McNeill, Jr., Sub.

is that, with modern communications and monitoring, satellites are becoming very popular. It is amazing what you can do with satellite monitoring.

So, right now, at the University of Waterloo in Ontario, they are using satellites to study land. They note the changes of the colours of different plants. They can tell whether it is going to be a late season, just from the satellite, looking at the land, they can tell whether fall was early this year or late, these type of things.

Now, if they can do that, I do not know why they would not be able to do that to monitor the caribou to determine which ways the herds are going and whether any pollution is being put out by the jets on the land. They should be able to tell by the colour of the land, this type of thing.

One other thing I want to mention is that someone here this evening was talking to the Panel and they said they did not think there were proper representatives on the Panel and that none of the people were people who lived off the land.

Now, what is a person who lives off the land? I do not know anyone who what you could call lives off the land properly around here. Everybody depends not totally on the land around here anymore.

Even if someone does work during the

year, part-time in the year, he still depends on store-bought products and money from welfare or Unemployment and so it is not totally off the land.

But, if there is anyone who does live off the land or knows how to live off the land, there is one person on that Panel that really knows how to live off the land.

If anyone here can keep up hauling seal nets with a fellow on that Panel, I would like to see them.

Even though he may not be living off the land right now, he knows exactly what it is like to live off the land.

Now, if we were to get a representative, there are people who come close to living off the land but, then, they cannot communicate properly. So the ideal person to have on the Panel would be someone who knows how to live off the land, has lived off of it and can still communicate very well also.

I know that that person is on the Panel right now.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Your comments are much appreciated.

Is there anyone else? Yes, please, come ahead.

---SUBMISSION BY MR. MERV ANDERSEN:

Merv Andersen, Sub.

MR. MERV ANDERSEN: Merv Andersen, fisherman.

I have been thinking about this quite a bit and I have had quite a few concerns.

I think my major concern really was the caribou herd, but, in the meantime, I am a fisherman and I suppose, deep down, it is a major concern to me.

The big concern I had about the caribou herd was when the military was in Goose Bay, the instances that have happened over on the Mealy Mountains that I have heard older people from Rigolet and people in Goose Bay talking about, how the military practically were the reason why the people in Rigolet and Cartwright and us here cannot hunt our land back here anymore because the caribou herd is gone.

They have known instances where military from Goose Bay have gone out and they have seen with their own eyes 40, 50 caribou dead on the ice. I do not know what the Yanks were thinking about. Maybe they thought they were Russians with horns on them or something.

Well, it has come to the point where the caribou herd in the Mealy Mountains was nearly wiped out.

Now, we are the ones that are suffering from that.

Merv Andersen, Sub.

My father hunted in here and a lot of the other younger people in the community, their fathers hunted over here on this land. We cannot and that is only a matter of a few years.

We are suffering for it. This land is closed from the Mealy Mountains down to Hopedale area and we cannot hunt. If we want caribou, we have to go north and get it because of this military growth in Goose Bay. I guess it is only one small example that we know about; how they have hurt the fishing of our lakes and stuff like that, I do not guess because nobody seems to have taken it too seriously in Ottawa.

That brings about another big concern of mine because I can tell you right off the bat that I do not trust our government. If we have to trust our government to make those decisions for us, if the military should go into Goose Bay or not and set down the Guidelines, I would say God help us.

I think you can talk to almost any fisherman in Canada and I know for a fact any fishermen in this province, the way our fishery is going. It is sad, because commercial fishery is dying, and when it boils down to it, it is Ottawa that is to blame because they do not care about us.

They certainly do not give us any consideration of our point of view or things like

Merv Andersen, Sub.

this. If they came with a Panel, like you guys, and got our point of view, the people's point of view, and looked at it seriously, I think you would come up with some excellent ideas of how things could go.

I know it is hard because we do not have -- the way Ottawa looks at it -- the experience, we are not doctors or lawyers or whatever, but we know what we are talking about when we are talking about our land. The fishery to us is our blood, it is our lifeline.

If we have a poor summer, how are we going to go and hunt our traplines? We are not going to be able to get any machine. We are not going to be able to get cartridges or guns to hunt our land. So it goes in a cycle and vice versa.

If a man does some trapping, and he does poor on his fur, he is not going to be ready for the fishery the next spring. So that is the way it goes. That is why it is so important to us.

The way the fishermen in this province look at it, the way Ottawa had handled the fishery, we were on a fast decline and the commercial fishery, if it keeps going like it is going now, it is going to be gone in years down the road.

They cannot even monitor all the draggers from foreign countries that come over here. They are just raping our land and if they cannot monitor

Merv Andersen, Sub.

boats, how in the hell are they going to monitor the planes that are flying over the land, if there are going to be hundreds of them?

It is these kinds of things that really bother me. I have to say that I do not have too much faith in our government. I would rather, for the people, to make the decisions or have a big making the decisions and for Ottawa to really listen to us. This kind of thing is not happening.

To us, it is so important. We cannot say how important it is. All we can come out and say is do not do this and do not do that. It is not that we are negative, because we are not. We would like to see the military on the basis of jobs and better livelihood for the people but, in the meantime, do not destroy what we have.

We understand the fine line between that. It is just that we have a deep concern and, that is why it is so important to us that maybe this Panel can come up with some really good ideas and decisions that maybe both of us can work side by side.

But, if we had the choice of the military and your land and sea and everything else that is going to be destroyed, I am sure you guys would go for no military.

It is the same as us. It is just the way we feel. It is like I said about the fishery,

Merv Andersen, Sub.

that if Ottawa cannot do any better with the military decision than they have on the fishery, it is going to be sad, it is going to be a sad situation.

I think you should seriously take into consideration what I brought up about the caribou herd on the Mealy Mountains because that had effect on us but that was only one herd.

We were lucky enough to have another herd but, if that herd is going to be seriously hurt, it is the one on the Mealy Mountains, it is going to drastically hurt the people on the coast.

The same thing with the fishery. If they are going to start going out to sea and doing these things, Ottawa is doing a hell of a poor job managing the fishery right now and, if this is going to come on top of it, as far as I am concerned, they just cannot handle it.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Is there any other resident of this community who would like to speak before we invite the final scheduled speaker to come on?

Even though this meeting was scheduled to end at ten o'clock, we do not mind at all going on a bit longer to make sure that everyone who wishes to be heard is heard.

Very well, then. If not, I will now invite Sharon Edmunds to come and speak to us on behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association.

---SUBMISSION BY MS SHARON EDMUNDS:

MS SHARON EDMUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is going to be very brief.

As you are all well aware and for the benefit of the audience here, I will explain.

LIA had a pretty lengthy presentation and we had decided to do it in three parts in three different communities on the north coast.

The first section was presented at Nain. The second part was presented in Rigolet last night and we had planned to present the third part here.

However, in consultation with the LIA head office and the Community Council of Makkovik, we felt that, rather than take up valuable time, that people would like to use in the community, that we would rather just submit our presentation to the Panel as Part III of our presentation, which is geared more to specific comment on the Guidelines, and it would be more technical and, therefore, quite lengthy for people to sit through.

There is nothing in Section III that has not already been said before. So I think that Mr. Barnes and a number of other people on the Panel

Sharon Edmunds, Sub.

are aware now that the presentation that LIA will be submitting is in Goose Bay and is in the hands of the information officer there and it will be available for you once you get into Goose Bay.

Unfortunately, we could not have copies here at this present time.

That is all I have to say.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms Edmunds.

I am sure that the people of Makkovik and Postville appreciate your consideration and I assure you that the written presentation that you are sending to us will be much appreciated by the Panel and will be, of course, part of the public record just as if it had been presented here tonight.

That would seem to complete our list of speakers.

In closing the meeting, I would, first, say that, if anyone is interested in following through on the review of this project and would like to have his or her name placed on our mailing list to receive all announcements, then would you kindly see Mr. Jim Clarke who is sitting in the doorway and he will take care of everything for you.

I would like to thank the people of Makkovik. You have made us feel welcome here in your community. We would like to thank especially those people who have welcomed some of us into your private homes in order that we may stay over here tonight. That is much appreciated.

I would thank all of the people who have come forward today and spoken to us and would like to thank also the ladies who worked so hard to provide the evening meal for the Panel tonight.

Thanks also to our Secretariat, to our recorder, reporter, Mrs. Thomson, to our audio technician, Mr. Sicoli, and to Mr. Sam Andersen in the room next door who has worked so hard as our interpreter.

Keep up your interest in the project and we promise that we will come back here on our next round of meetings on this project.

Thank you very much. Good night.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Volume

18

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REVIEW PANEL

COMMISSION D'EVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE

Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PLACE	HULL	ENDROIT
DATE	November 17, 1986.	DATE
VOLUME	18	VOLUME

OFFICIAL REPORTERS
Angus, Stonehouse & Co. Ltd.,
251 Bank Street, Suite 705,
Ottawa, Ontario. K2P 1X3
235-1711

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.
TORONTO—OTTAWA—WINNIPEG

Environmental Assessment Review Panel Review of Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Quebec

Commission d'évaluation environnementale au sujet des activités de vols militaires au Labrador et au Québec

PANEL:

D.H. BARNES	Chairman/Président
T.H. NORTHCOTT	Member/Membre
W.D. STEWART	Member/Membre
T. McNEILL	Member/Membre
P.E. WILKINSON	Member/Membre
W. JOURDAIN	Member/Membre
CAROL MARTIN	Executive Secretary/ Secrétaire Exécutif

HELD AT: Palais de Congres, Salon La Desert, Hull

DATE: November 17, 1986.

VOLUME: 18

INDEX

PAGE

Introduction by Mr. P. Wilkinson 2048
Presentation by Major Marc Dumais 2067

SUBMISSIONS/QUESTIONS BY:

Josee Mailhot 2083
Claris Rudkowski 2105
Jacques Coster 2114
Edmond Malec 2116
Josee Mailhot 2117
Robert Lanarie 2117
Josee Mailhot 2119
Robert Lanarie 2120
Gilles Tardif 2122
Francine Fournier 2124
Claris Rudkowski 2149
Ian Strachen 2150
Francine Fournier 2153
Josee Mailhot 2160
Lilianne Cotnoir 2164
Father Len Paradis 2180
Lilianne Cotnoir 2209
John McGraw 2210
Claris Rudkowski 2211
Bart Jack 2212

* * * * *

---Upon commencing at 9:00 A.M. in Hull, Quebec:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. My name is David Barnes. I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment to conduct a public environmental review of certain existing and proposed military flying activities based at Goose Bay, Labrador, and involving flying activities over part of Labrador and parts of the Province of Quebec.

This is the last of a series of public meetings being held primarily to hear comments on a draft document entitled "Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement". Because we are meeting in the Province of Quebec, and because I do not happen to be fluent in French, I will be asking Doctor Paul Wilkinson, at my left, to assist me in the operation of this meeting by presenting certain information to you in French. Perhaps, then, we might begin by having Doctor Wilkinson introduce to you the other members of the Panel.

'DD

M. P.E. WILKINSON: Bonjour, Mesdames Messieurs, je pense que par politesse, je vais vous présenter en premier le Président de notre Commission qui est assis à ma droite, il s'agit du docteur David Barnes. Monsieur Barnes est directeur de la région de l'Atlantique, du Bureau fédéral d'examen des évaluations environnementales.

Monsieur Barnes a passé plusieurs années au service du ministère de l'Environnement du gouvernement de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador. Et pendant cette période, il a travaillé à la préparation de la première loi environnementale à Terre-Neuve et au Labrador.

À votre gauche, à ma droite, je vous présente Monsieur Don Stewart; Monsieur Stewart est brigadier général à la retraite des forces armées canadiennes. Au cours de sa carrière, Monsieur Stewart a été commandant de la base des forces armées à Goose Bay et juste avant de prendre sa retraite, il a été commandant adjoint d'une région du NORAD.

À côté de Monsieur Stewart, est assis Monsieur Tom Northcott, Monsieur Northcott est biologiste; il est présentement vice-président de la Société Northland Associés à St-John's, Terre-Neuve. Avant de se joindre à cette compagnie, Monsieur Northcott était biologiste chercheur à la division de la faune du gouvernement de Terre-Neuve.

À côté de Monsieur Northcott, est Monsieur Tim McNeill. Monsieur McNeill demeure à Makkovic sur la côte du Labrador. Il est propriétaire d'une petite entreprise.

Monsieur McNeill a été nommé à cette Commission en grande partie, à cause de ses connaissances des préoccupations de la population de la côte du Labrador. On peut aussi mentionner qu'il a été impliqué il y a quelques années au processus d'évaluation des impacts d'un projet minier dans la région de Makkovic.

À ma gauche est Monsieur William Jourdain. Monsieur Jourdain est indien montagnais de Sept Iles. Il est à présent membre du conseil de la bande montagnaise de Sept Iles à Maliotenam.

Avant de prendre sa retraite, Monsieur Jourdain a travaillé, je pense que c'était soit, vingt (20), vingt-cinq (25) années pour la minière IOC, Iron Ore à Innu Company of Canada, dans la région de Wabush., de Schefferville et de la côte nord.

Monsieur Jourdain a été aussi le premier directeur d'un centre d'achats à Sept Iles, connu sous le nom de Galeries Montagnaises, un centre d'achats qui appartient aux indiens de Sept Iles.

Moi, je suis Paul Wilkinson, je suis biologiste, anthropologue; je travaille dans le nord canadien depuis une vingtaine d'années.

Au cours des dix (10) dernières années, j'ai beaucoup travaillé avec les indiens Naskapi de Schefferville. J'étais impliqué dans la négociation de la convention qu'ils ont signée avec le gouvernement du Québec et le gouvernement du Canada en soixante-dix-huit ('78).

Je suis à présent consultant et ma base est à Montréal. Je tiens à faire ce matin, deux (2) choses. Premièrement, de vous présenter brièvement une explication du processus auquel nous participons aujourd'hui et deuxièmement, de vous résumer l'ébauche de directives qui fait l'objet principal de cette réunion aujourd'hui.

Le processus d'évaluation des incidences environnementales de certaines activités aériennes militaires qui se déroulent au Labrador et au Québec est régies par un décret du gouvernement fédéral qui a été adopté dans sa présente forme au mois de juin mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984).

Il s'agit du décret sur les lignes directrices visant le processus d'évaluation et d'examen en matière d'environnement.

Une des premières choses que fait cette directive est de stipuler que certaines catégories d'activités sont soumises au processus d'évaluation. Pour les citer, il s'agit de projets devant être réalisés directement par un Ministère responsable, c'est-à-dire, un Ministère du gouvernement fédéral où des activités pouvant avoir des répercussions environnementales sur une question de compétence fédérale ou troisièmement, pour lesquelles le gouvernement du Canada s'engage financièrement ou quatrièmement, des activités devant être réalisées sur des terres administrées par le gouvernement du Canada, y compris la haute mer.

Je pense que cela explique pourquoi les activités que nous évaluons aujourd'hui ont été soumises à ce processus d'examen fédéral.

Premièrement, il s'agit principalement ou en grande partie d'activités qui se déroulent dans l'espace aérienne qui est de juridiction fédérale. Il s'agit d'activités qui sont en grande partie ou qui seraient en grande partie , financées par le gouvernement fédéral. Il s'agit également d'activités qui auraient lieu sur des terres administrées par le gouvernement du Canada.

Le processus commence avec ce qu'on appelle une évaluation initiale des incidences potentielles de l'activité proposée. Cette évaluation initiale a été entreprise par le ministère de la Défense Nationale en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-un (1981).

Au cours de la journée, on va sans doute utiliser deux (2) termes. Premièrement, le terme promoteur et deuxièmement, le terme ministère responsable, en anglais "promoter and initiating department". Afin de simplifier notre journée, j'expliquerai maintenant que dans les deux (2) cas, il s'agit du ministère de la Défense Nationale. Et normalement, au cours de mes présentations, j'utiliserai le terme promoteur.

Donc, l'évaluation initiale qui a été basée surtout sur une analyse de la littérature qui n'impliquait pas de recherches originales, de recherches sur le terrain, a été entreprise par le ministère de la Défense Nationale, le promoteur, en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-un (1981).

Le résultat de cette étude sera expliqué en plus de détails un peu plus tard dans la journée par un représentant de la Défense Nationale. Mais le résultat était, brièvement, qu'il ne prévoyait aucune incidence majeure sur l'environnement, mais que les impacts de ces activités sur les caribous, étant inconnus que ça méritait l'application d'une politique au moins d'éviter le caribou.

Le décret prévoit qu'en dépendant soit des résultats de l'évaluation initiale, soit de l'attention accordée au projet par le public, ces activités peuvent être à la demande du promoteur, du ministère de la Défense Nationale, soumises à une évaluation plus détaillée de leurs incidences potentielles sur l'environnement.

La décision de demander au ministre de l'environnement du Canada de soumettre ces activités à une telle étude détaillée a été prise au mois de février de cette année.

En ce moment, le Ministre adjoint à la Défense Nationale qui était au mois de février, Monsieur Harvey André, a écrit au Ministre de l'Environnement, Monsieur Thomas McMillan, lui demandant d'entreprendre les démarches nécessaires pour que ces activités militaires courantes et proposées, soient soumises à une étude détaillée des impacts potentiels.

Suite à cette lettre, la deuxième (2e) étape était de nommer, de créer cette Commission. Et là, les membres de la Commission ont été nommés au mois de juillet de cette année.

Je pourrais peut-être expliquer ici qu'au début, la Comission avait sept (7) membres. Malheureusement, il y a quelques semaines, un de ses membres a dû démissionner pour des raisons professionnelles et il sera, je pense, remplacé d'ici quelques semaines.

La première responsabilité de cette Commission est de préparer ce qu'on appelle une directive. Une directive est une description pour le bénéfice du promoteur de l'étude détaillée que le promoteur devrait entreprendre.

La première ébauche de cette directive a été préparée par la Commission en utilisant sa propre expertise, les résultats de certaines réunions qui ont été tenues au Québec et au Labrador avec les groupes et les particuliers les plus directement touchés par le projet. Et aussi à l'aide de certaines analyses de la littérature entreprises par le secrétariat de la Commission.

L'ébauche de directive a été rendue publique au mois d'août et après un délai établi dans nos procédures de régie interne, une série.. une première série de réunions a commencé vers le début du mois de septembre.

Jusqu'ici, nous avons eu dix-sept (17) telles réunions dont quinze (15) au Labrador et au Québec, dans les régions plus directement affectées par ces activités. Les quinzième (15e) et seisième (16e) réunions ont eu lieu à Montréal et à St-John's.

Le but de cette réunion qui est la dernière, c'est d'offrir aux personnes et aux organismes qui pour diverses raisons, n'ont pas pu nous rencontrer, c'est de leur offrir une dernière occasion de nous présenter leurs commentaires sur la directive.

Les étapes qui restent à réaliser sont, premièrement, qu'à la lumière des commentaires reçus au cours de cette première série d'audiences publiques, la Commission va préparer une version finale de la directive. Effectivement, nous commençons dès demain, trois (3) journées de réunion pour analyser les...je pense que c'est à peu près les deux mille (2,000) pages de compte rendu, qu'ont produit nos dix-sept (17) réunions.

Comme je l'ai mentionné, la directive et la description détaillée de l'étude que le ministère de la Défense Nationale doit entreprendre afin d'améliorer nos connaissances sur les incidences environnementales potentielles des activités qu'il se propose d'entreprendre.

Une fois cette étude terminée, je pense que selon l'échéancier provisoire, l'espoir est que l'étude sera terminée vers la fin de l'été prochain, l'été de quatre-vingt-sept ('87). Dès cette étude terminée, elle sera rendue publique, après un délai approprié pour que les personnes et les organismes impliqués puissent analyser l'étude, cette Commission va entreprendre une deuxième (2e) tournée d'audiences publiques, lors desquelles, nous espérons recueillir les commentaires du public et des organismes intéressés sur l'étude entreprise par le promoteur.

Suite à ça, la Commission,en se basant sur ces audiences publiques, sur sa propre expertise, la Comission va préparer son rapport et ses recommandations. Nos recommandations seront acheminées au Ministre de l'Environnement et au Ministre de la Défense Nationale.

Et je tiens à souligner que la Commission n'a aucun pouvoir décisionnel; notre mandat est de soumettre des recommandation au Ministre impliqué. Et ce sont ces Ministres, surtout le Ministre de la Défense Nationale qui va prendre la décision finale.

Donc, j'espère que ça résume, sans trop d'erreurs, le processus, et je demanderais seulement au Président d'apporter toutes corrections qui seraient nécessaires. Monsieur Barnes a fait ce discours je dirais à peu près vingt-cinq (25) fois, donc, il le connaît peut-être mieux que moi.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Doctor Wilkinson.

There is one additional piece of information which I presume I am free to make available at this time, because just this morning I have received a letter from the Department of National Defence indicating some new information concerning the proposed schedule for this review from the point of view of the Department of National Defence. We may hear a little more of this later but as I understand it from that letter, the Department of National Defence hopes to be ready to begin the process of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement sometime early in 1987. As part of that work, the Department has to engage certain expertise under contract to assist them in that task, and as I understand it, that is expected to happen approximately March of 1987.

This would result in a schedule in which the Environmental Impact Statement might be ready to be presented to the Panel, perhaps, in January of 1988. Now, that is a significant difference from the sort of schedule that we had been presenting at earlier meetings in this series, but I think it is important to understand this now, if this is to be the new schedule, and, certainly, on the basis of that information the Panel will be issuing information about the revised schedule for the review to the public in the very near future.

Recognizing that following the submission of the Environmental Impact Statement early in 1988, there will have to be a period of review of that document, followed by public hearings, to be held at a suitable time. It is certainly reasonable, I believe, to expect that this Panel would not be ready to present its report to the Government of Canada before late summer or early fall of 1988 at the earliest, but, as I say, the Panel will be issuing some information about that in the near future.

Going on then, with the usual pattern of these meetings, it has become the customary practice of Panels holding meetings of this sort to invite to the meeting a representative of the proponent to -- excuse me, before we get to that, I believe Doctor Wilkinson is prepared to say something about the content of the Guidelines document, which he has already mentioned. This would be a good time and so if you would go ahead with that now, Doctor Wilkinson.

M. P.E. WILKINSON: Bon, Monsieur le Président, juste dans le cas où certaines personnes n'auraient pas eu l'occasion d'étudier en profondeur le contenu de l'ébauche de directives que nous avons préparée, habituellement à ces réunions, nous offrons une explication brève de ce document.

Après certaines définitions, après un genre d'historique ou d'introduction, la directive explique la portée de son mandat, la portée de l'étude que doit entreprendre le ministère de la Défense Nationale.

Ce qui est à souligner c'est que la Commission a décidé de diviser, ce que nous appelons le projet en deux (2) éléments. Premièrement, le premier élément est les vols d'entraînement à basse altitude qui sont effectués en vertu de certaines ententes entre le gouvernement du Canada et les gouvernements de certains des pays membres de l'OTAN.

Le deuxième (2e) élément du projet est l'établissement et l'exploitation d'un centre d'entraînement à l'emploi des armes, des chasseurs tactiques pour l'entraînement des forces aériennes des membres de l'OTAN.

Les raisons pour lesquelles nous avons divisé ce projet en deux (2) parties, sont les suivantes. Premièrement, ces vols d'entraînement à basse altitude se poursuivent déjà depuis mil neuf cent soixante-dix-neuf (1979). Et selon le mandat que cette Commission a reçu, l'intention du gouvernement du Canada est que ces vols vont se poursuivre et que le nombre en sera probablement augmenté. Donc, le mandat de cette Commission est de recommander au promoteur des moyens de réduire tout effet néfaste de ces vols d'entraînement à basse altitude.

La possibilité qu'un centre de formation pour l'OTAN, sera construit et exploité dans la région de Goose Bay, n'est qu'une possibilité. Donc, dans ce cas, le mandat de la Commission est de recommander aux autorités fédérales responsables si oui ou non et avec quelles conditions le gouvernement pourrait procéder avec ce projet. Donc, pour ces raisons, nous avons jugé bon de diviser nos activités en deux (2).

La partie suivante de la directive établies certains critères, certaines considérations méthodologiques. C'est une section assez technique et je ne vais pas expliquer aujourd'hui ces détails; je dirai tout simplement qu'en se basant sur des conditions rigoureuses, sur des publications très très récentes, la Commission exige que le promoteur utilise une méthodologie extrêmement rigoureuse.

Une des parties les plus importantes de la directive est la partie cinq (5) dans laquelle la Commission essaie d'établir certains aspects de l'étude auxquels le promoteur doit accorder une attention toute particulière.

'DD

Ces aspects sont tellement importants que je vais vous les lire. Premièrement, on veut que le promoteur étudie en détail les effets du bruit produits par les aéronefs volant à basse altitude sur les humains et la faune.

Deuxièmemement, il doit étudier les effets les vols d'entraînement militaire à basse altitude sur les modes de vie de subsistance et l'utilisation des terres.

Troisièmement, on veut que le promoteur étudie les possibilités de développement économique de la région de Happy Valley et de Goose Bay ainsi que d'autres communautés se trouvant dans le secteur sur lequel porte le projet.

Quatrièmement, il faut évaluer les incidences du projet sur les activités commerciales qui dépendent des ressources renouvelables.

La cinquième (5e) question est les incidences du projet sur le milieu.. excusez-moi, ce sont les incidences sur le milieu naturel, premièrement des travaux de construction associés à l'expansion de l'aéroport de Goose Bay; et deuxièmement des échappements supplémentaires causés par l'intensification des activités de vols.

Sixièmement, le promoteur doit étudier les effets cumulatifs du projet et d'autres programmes et activités réalisés dans la région. Septièmement, il faut qu'il évalue le besoin de contrôle. Je vais juste vérifier la traduction...

Ah okay, excusez-moi, quand on parle ici de contrôle, on parle plutôt de surveillance, ce qu'on appelle en anglais du "monitoring", c'est-à-dire les activités de recherche qui pourraient s'avérer nécessaires une fois le projet réalisé, afin de suivre, de mieux comprendre les effets des activités militaires sur le milieu biologique, humain, physique, etc.. Je pense que la traduction ici n'est pas très très précise, on va corriger ou améliorer ça.

La huitième (8e) question est, les incidences des champs de tirs terrestres et marins et des champs d'entraînement. Et finalement, nous exigeons que le promoteur évalue les effets du projet sur les résultats des négociations au sujet des revendications territoriales des autochtones. Ici, il faut noter que la Commission a jugé qu'il s'agit ici d'une question très importante, même si la Commission reconnaît que son mandat ne porte pas et ne peut pas porter sur la politique ou les politiques gouvernementales concernant ces revendications territoriales. Tout de même, à notre opinion, l'étude doit porter sur les incidences des activités courantes et proposées sur les résultats de négociations qui pourraient être entreprises en vertu des politiques existantes. Mais la Commission n'a pas pour mandat de mettre en question les politiques elles-mêmes. C'est une distinction assez importante.

Finalement ici, il faut noter que la liste que je viens de lire n'est pas exhaustive. Le but de cette liste est tout simplement d'attirer l'attention du promoteur sur certains aspects que la Commission considère excessivement importants. Il y aurait sans doute d'autres aspects à étudier et le promoteur devrait les étudier.

Les quinze (15) dernières pages de l'ébauche de directives sont plus ou moins une table des matières détaillées pour le rapport que va préparer le promoteur. Et je ne vais pas les expliquer en détail. Je noterai toutefois que la Commission exige qu'un résumé détaillé du rapport soit préparé. On veut que ce résumé soit préparé, bien sûr, en français et en anglais mais aussi en langue autochtone pour que les résidants de la région, c'est-à-dire les Innut , les Naskapi, les Montagnais, les Innuits du nord québécois et du Labrador, puissent lire avec compréhension le rapport du promoteur.

On veut aussi que le résumé soit relativement vulgarisé, c'est un document qui devrait être compréhensible à n'importe quel citoyen, entre quillemets, ordinaire. Ça se peut que le rapport lui-même sera assez technique, assez difficile à comprendre pour des personnes qui ne sont pas spécialistes mais on veut que le résumé soit accessible à tout le monde; et que le résumé explique clairement les principales conclusions de l'étude.

Et je pense que je vais mentionner seulement un autre aspect, c'est que la directive accorde beaucoup d'attention au besoin de bien surveiller les effets des activités courantes et proposées, ce que j'ai mentionné il y a quelques minutes, les activités de "monitoring".

Je pense que je vais terminer cette partie de l'exposé ici mais s'il y a des questions et des commentaires sur l'ébauche de directives, je ferai de mon mieux pour y répondre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you again, Doctor Wilkinson. I think, indeed, that this might be a good time to ask if there are any questions either on the review process, or the Guidelines document, in particular, as just presented by Doctor Wilkinson. If anyone has a question, I would like him or her to use either of the two microphones on the floor and to state your name clearly for the record before you pose the question. We will be quite pleased to entertain questions in either English or French, whichever you prefer.

Does anyone have a question? If not then, we will go on with the usual procedure of the meeting and that would be next to hear a presentation concerning the Project itself, the Project which is under review here.

For this purpose, as is customary, we have invited to the meeting representatives of the Proponent; that is, the Department of National Defence, who will make a presentation concerning the Project and who will then be prepared to respond to questions on the nature of the Project. After that presentation we will have a break in the meeting during which you may come forward to speak to either the representatives of National Defence, or the members of the Panel; perhaps take a look at the maps that have been placed on the wall at the side, and following the coffee break we will then go on to hear from the speakers who have indicated us, in advance, that they would like to speak to the

Panel at this meeting. If there is anyone else who would like to speak and who has not pre-registered with us, I would ask you to approach one of the members of the Secretariat to the Panel, whom I will introduce in a moment, and give your name and your affiliation, if you are speaking on behalf of a group, and we will certainly be pleased to place your name on the schedule of speakers.

The Panel is supported in its activities by a very able Secretariat, consisting of three persons. I would like to introduce each of these gentlemen to you in order that you will be able to see them if you want to register to speak, or if you would like to obtain any information from the office concerning this review. First of all, the Executive Secretary to the Panel is Mr. Carol Martin, at the back of the room. He is assisted by, first of all, Mr. Michel Bourgon, on your left standing, and at the back near the door, Mr. Jim Clark.

At this time then I would like to introduce to you two representatives of the Department of National Defence, who have come here today to present information concerning the Project. They are, first of all, Major David McCabe, and secondly, Major Marc Dumais. If you gentlemen are ready, I would ask you to be seated at the table beside and to proceed with your presentation.

MAJOR MARC DUMAIS:

Monsieur le Président, membres de la Commission, Mesdames et Messieurs, bonjour. Mon nom est le major Dumais et à ma droite est le major McCabe. Nous travaillons dans la section des plans aériens au quartier général de la défense nationale, à Ottawa.

Quoique nous travaillons pour le même directeur, c'est en fait le major McCabe qui s'occupe spécifiquement du projet en question ici aujourd'hui, soit le centre d'entraînement de chasse tactique d'OTAN.

Comme l'a indiqué Monsieur Barnes, mon intention est de présenter dans les vingt-cinq (25) prochaines minutes, environ, la proposition pour ce centre d'entraînement. La présentation comprend trois (3) sections, l'aspect historique de Goose Bay, la situation actuelle et finalement le centre d'entraînement proposé.

Premièrement l'aspect historique. L'aéroport de Goose Bay a été construit en mil neuf cent quarante et un (1941) pour servir de point d'escale aux avions qui transitaient vers l'Europe pour appuyer l'effort de guerre.

Depuis cette époque, l'aérodrome a été le théâtre d'une activité militaire constante bien qu'elle ait varié en intensité. Dans les années de pointe, près de douze mille (12,000) militaires et leur famille vivaient à l'aérodrome.

La US Air Force y maintenait des avions intercepteurs pour la défense aérienne et une importante flotte d'avions de ravitaillement en vol pour appuyer les bombardiers à longs rayons d'action du Strategic Air Command.

De la fin des années cinquante ('50) à mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), la Royal Air Force y a effectué des vols d'entraînement à la navigation à basse altitude sur des bombardiers Vulcan.

En mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984), le Vulcan qui prenait de l'âge a été remplacé par le Tornado. La Royal Air Force a également utilisé au cours des dernières années, des Phantoms,Harriers,des Buccaneers,et des Jaguars.

Depuis mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980), il y a eu un accroissement considérable du nombre de vols militaires , surtout les vols à basse altitude. Étant donné que l'aviation allemande commençait elle aussi à manifester de l'intérêt pour les opérations d'entraînement aériennes à Goose Bay, c'est à cette époque que le ministère de la Défense Nationale a effectué une première évaluation environnementale, pour déterminer si l'accroissement du vol à basse altitude pouvait avoir des effets néfastes sur l'environnement, compte tenu de la nécessité d'avoir des champs de tirs aériens. Cette évaluation s'est limitée à une étude sommaire des données existantes sur ce type d'activités. Il ne s'agissait pas d'une étude approfondie sur le terrain mené par des spécialistes. Les auteurs de l'évaluation ont conclu que les effets néfastes sur l'environnement seraient négligeables mais étant donné que les données existantes sur les caribous n'étaient pas concluantes, ils ont recommandé l'adoption d'une politique qui consiste à éviter le plus possible ces animaux.

Afin de coordonner et de contrôler efficacement et en toute sécurité les vols militaires à l'échelon local, un centre de coordination militaire a été établi en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-quatre (1984).

Doté d'un personnel composé de militaires des Forces Canadiennes, le centre de coordination examine tous les plans de vols militaires de la région et sur une base quotidienne, il informe les équipages des restrictions locales comme les concentrations de caribous et les camps de chasse ou de pêche en activité lorsque leur existence est connue.

La zone d'entraînement du nord a été subdivisiée en trois (3) sections, afin qu'il soit possible de fermer une section au besoin pour éviter les migrations de caribous et les aires de vêlage.

De plus, les camps qui sont occupés sont indiqués sur des cartes destinées aux équipages et leurs emplacements est entouré d'un cercle qui délimite une zone de cinq mille (5,000) de diamètre que doivent éviter les avions volant à basse altitude.

Maintenant, la deuxième (2e) partie pour la situation actuelle à Goose Bay. Actuellement, quatre (4) pays utilisent les installations de Gosse Bay pour leur entraînement militaire. Ils sont tous signataires d'un protocole d'entente multinational de dix (10) ans, signé en février de cette année.

Ce protocole d'entente couvre toutes les activités d'entraînement aérien à Goose Bay. La US Air Force a un petit détachement dont le role principal consiste à faire l'entretien courant des avions de transport qui font escale à Goose Bay, sur les vols à destination ou en provenance de l'Europe.

Les Forces Canadiennes font fonctionner le radar de défense aérienne à longue portée et le radar de contrôle de la circulation aérienne, assurant l'entretien courant des avions militaires canadiens en transit;et depuis mars de cette année, dispose en permanence de trois (3) hélicoptères de sauvetage qui manoeuvrent à partir de Goose Bay.

En mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-huit (1988), les Forces Canadiennes établiront un détachement opérationnel à Goose Bay et quatre (4) avions CF-18 y seront affectés pour la défense aérienne et l'affirmation de la souveraineté canadienne.

La Royal Air Force entraîne ses équipages au vol à basse altitude à l'aide de neuf (9) avions Tornado qui sont gardés à l'aérodrome pendant toute la saison de vol. L'aviation allemande entraîne son équipage sur divers appareils comme le F-4 Phantom, l'Alpha Jet et le Tornado. Elle a une vingtaine d'avions sur place en tout temps.

Les équipages de ces avions ne s'entraînent pas seulement à la navigation à basse altitude et aux manoeuvres tactiques. Ils utilisent aussi parfois le champ de tir aérien, situé à environ soixante-cinq (65) milles.

Ce champ de tir est une zone sablonneuse, dégagée où la végétation a été brûlée par un feu de forêt. Son diamètre est de huit (8) milles soit environ treize (13) kilomètres et les points de repères y sont clairement marqués par des affiches en quatre (4) langues.

Seules des bombes de pratique, non explosives et non contaminées.. excusez, non contaminantes sont utilisées dans ce champ de tir. Et certaines de ces bombes sont dotés d'un petit dispositif fumigène pour indiquer le point d'impact.

À l'heure actuelle, on ne prévoit pas utiliser de champ, ce champ pour des tirs réels. On est en train d'examiner un autre cite dans la zone d'entraînement du nord en vue d'y établir un second champ de tir aérien mais ce projet n'a pas encore été approuvé officiellement.

Comme Monsieur Wilkinson a mentionné plus tôt,les pays qui utilisent actuellement les installations de Goose Bay, ont manifesté le désir d'étendre quelque peu leurs opérations au cours des prochaines années. De plus, les négociateurs négocient avec le gouvernement des Pays-Bas, en vue de l'établissement d'un programme d'entraînement à long terme à Goose Bay.

En passant, notez que dans le présent processus, le Bureau Fédéral d'Examen de l'Évaluation Environnementale tiendra compte des activités des Pays-Bas. L'aviation royale des Pays-Bas espère mener à bien un programme d'entraînement d'une demi-saison en mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-sept (1987), en utilisant de dix (10) à douze (12) chasseurs F-16 et environ cent vingt (120) militaires.

Le programme d'entraînement élargi, continuera à être centré sur le vol à basse altitude avec quelques exercices de vols de nuit et de vols par mauvais temps au besoin. Ces deux (2) dernières activités servent à entraîner l'équipage à l'utilisation du radar de suivi de terrain qui est installé actuellement à bord de l'avio Tornado.

Troisième (3e) partie, sur le centre d'entraînement proposé. L'autre projet qui est envisagé pour Goose Bay est le centre d'entraînement de chasse tactique de l'OTAN qui est en fait une école pour le pilotes d'avions militaires. Bien qu'il ne s'agisse pour le moment que d'une proposition, ce projet a capté l'attention du public à cause de son envergure et de son champ d'activités potentielles.

Avant de vous donner les détails sur cette proposition, je vais vous expliquer brièvement comment on en est venu à ce projet de centre d'entraînement de l'OTAN. Une grande partie de l'entraînement tactique des forces aériennes de l'OTAN, s'effectuent au dessus des pays densément peuplés de l'Europe de l'ouest avec une forte concentration en Allemagne de l'ouest.

L'année dernière, il y a eu environ cinq cent trente-huit mille (538,000) vols au dessus du territoire de l'Allemagne de l'ouest de jour comme de nuit, malgré les soixante-trois millions (63,000,000) d'habitants que compte ce pays. Quelques cent-dix mille (110,000) de ces vols ont été effectués à basse altitude. Les zones d'entraînement existantes sont très limitées en termes de dimension et de capacité.

En effet, certains types d'exercices sont très difficiles à réaliser dans certains pays à cause du manque d'installations adéquates. En mil neuf cent quatre-vingt (1980) ayant reconnu la nécessité de combler les lacunes des programmes d'entraînements nationaux et de maintenir l'effet de dissuasion que produit une force aérienne classique bien entraînée, l'OTAN a étudié la possibilité d'établir un centre intégré d'entraînement à la chasse tactique qui offrirait une formation complète à toutes les équipages de l'OTAN.

On a alors demandé aux divers pays de préciser leurs besoins en matière d'entraînement et à partir de ces données, un groupe de travail de l'OTAN a établi des caractéristiques du centre d'entraînement idéal pour répondre à tous les besoins. Étant donné que le groupe de travail ne s'est vu imposer aucune contrainte de coût pour cette étape de définition de l'envergure du projet, il a proposé un centre d'entraînement très vaste permettant toutes les activités.

Les caractéristiques de ce centre d'entraînement sont expliquées en détail dans le rapport de la phase un (1) comme on l'appelle, qui a été présenté aux autorités de l'OTAN en juin quatre-vingt-trois ('83). Deux (2) pays ont offert un emplacement pour le centre. Le Canada a offert Goose Bay et la Turquie a offert la base aérienne de Konya. Ces deux (2) sites potentiels ont été examinés l'année dernière et une recommandation initiale a été présentée par le groupe de travail.

L'OTAN devrait décider d'ici décembre de cette année lequel de ces emplacements convient le mieux. Lorsque l'emplacement aura été choisi, on abordera la phase quatre (4) du projet. Des négociations seront entreprises avec le pays hôte et des plans détaillés seront élaborés, en tenant compte des besoins revisés des différents pays et des restrictions opérationnelles et environnementales qui pourraient influencer directement les plans.

Cette phase de planification devrait être terminée en décembre quatre-vingt-huit ('88). Au cours de cette phase, si on rencontre des obstacles insurmontables, l'autre emplacement proposé sera examiné.

Le centre d'entraînement devrait être opérationnel au début des années quatre-vingt-dix ('90) à moins d'un retard important . Le centre d'entraînement à la chasse tactique, dans ses dimensions idéales, accueillerait jusqu'à cent trente-six (136) avions de chasse qui effectueraient environ deux cents (200) sorties par jour. Il y aurait à chaque année, vingt (20) détachement d'une durée de deux (2) semaines, autrement dit, la période d'entraînement serait d'environ quarante (40) semaines par années.

Toutes les deux (2) semaines, à cause de l'arrivée du nouveau détachement, les avions de transport devraient effectuer jusqu'à quarante-cinq (45) sorties pour appuyer le roulement du personnel et de l'équipement. Avec chaque détachement, on verrait transiter toutes les deux (2) semaines,un maximum de trois cent soixante et dix (370) membres d'équipage et de mille trois cents (1,300) membres du personnel au sol.

Pour les appuyer, il y aurait un personnel de soutien multinational d'environ mille sept cents (1700) membres. Étant donné que les membres de ce personnel de soutien, seraient affectés à Goose Bay pour deux (2) ou trois (3) ans, bon nombre d'entre eux amèneraient leur famille avec eux ce qui augmenterait la population de la région d'un autre mille (1,000) à quinze cents (1,500) personnels.

Il faudrait des installations comme des hangars à avion, des ateliers d'entretien, des centres des opérations, des casernes, des logements familiaux, des installations récréatives et des magasins. La construction initiale inclurait la modernisation des installations de l'aérodrome,comme la construction d'une piste parallèle et la restauration des systèmes d'entreposage et de livraison du combustible.

Il faudrait établir un système d'approvisionnement régulier ce qui pourrait nécessiter une prolongation de la saison de navigation ou une expansion du réseau d'autoroute du Labrador qui est actuellement en construction. Pour ce qui est du type d'entraînement qui serait offert, je dois souligner que pour le moment, il n'existe qu'un modèle optimal hypothétique pour le centre. Étant donné que les besoins initiaux étaient fondés sur des estimations qui datent de mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-un (1981), il est possible que l'on fasse certains ajustements pendant la phase de conception et de planification détaillée, c'est-à-dire, au cours des deux (2) prochaines années.

Je me contenterai de dire que d'après la proposition actuelle les avions prendraient part à plusieurs activités d'entraînement selon leur rôle particulier. Il pourrait s'agir des activités suivantes. La navigation et reconnaissance tactique à basse altitude; l'entraînement au combat aérien à haute et à moyenne altitude, y compris le vol supersonique; entraînement à la guerre électronique à à l'aide de l'équipement électronique à bord des avions et au sol. Exercice de tir avec armes d'entraînement idéal dans quatre (4) champs de tir semblables à celui qui existe aujourd'hui. Exercice de tir réel pour lequel il faudrait idéalement établir trois (3) champs de tir; appui aérien tactique des opérations maritimes, c'est-à-dire lutte anti-navire. Et finalement, exercice à grand déploiement mettant en jeu de nombreux avions dans leurs rôles divers volant tous en même temps et s'appuyant les uns, les autres.

Plusieurs installations sont considérées comme souhaitables sûrement car on reconnaît que des facteurs de restriction pourraient empêcher leur réalisation. C'est le cas notamment de la zone maritime d'exercice de tir que l'on souhaite établir et qui n'est finalement qu'une zone où les avions s'entraîneraient aux manoeuvres tactiques anti-navire.

De temps à autres, ils pourraient également tirer sur des cibles remorquées par des navires. Plusieurs zones maritimes de ce genre existent déjà au large des côtes du Canada et des États-Unis.

Un autre exemple de.. est le champ de tir air-air est un élément optionnel. Étant donné que la zone située sous un tel champ doit être stérile et non peuplée, il faudrait probablement l'établir au dessus de l'océan.

Depuis l'énoncé initial des besoins en matière de champ de tir réel, dans le rapport de quatre-vingt-trois ('83), il y a eu des progrès technologiques et il est désormais possible pour un avion de faire des exercices de bombardements contre ces cibles... contres des cibles réalistes au sol, sans utiliser de munition.

Ce système connu sous le nom système de contrôle de bombardement sans largage a de nombreux avantages, telle que la protection de l'environnement et les importantes économies de munitions qu'il permet de réaliser. Le centre d'entraînement de l'OTAN serait probablement doté d'un tel système. Cependant, s'il s'avérait quand même nécessaire d'établir un champ de tir réel, des critères très sévères seraient appliqués dans le choix de l'emplacement.

Ces champs de tir sont surveillés de près et sont nettoyés régulièrement. Les avantages socio-économiques qui découlent d'un tel projet sont directement proportionnels à l'envergure du projet. Le ministère de la Défense Nationale est en train de finir une étude socio-économique fondée sur l'expansion des opérations actuelles et sur le projet de l'OTAN.

En ce qui concerne ce projet, on a examiné que l'option idéale telle que proposée dans le rapport de la phase un (1), par conséquent les données qui en résultent ont un caractère hautement spéculatif car toute réduction de l'envergure du projet entraînerait une réduction proportionnelle des avantages socio-économiques.

En ce qui concerne la création d'emploi, il y aurait deux (2) phases distinctes. La phase de construction initiale et la phase d'exploitation courante. L'année dernière, lors de l'examen du site, le groupe de travail de l'OTAN a envisagé la possibilité d'établir des aérodromes de déroutement à Wabush , à Churchill Falls et à Schefferville. Les aérodromes de déroutement sont utilisés pour les attérissages d'urgence et en cas de diversion causée par le mauvais temps. Ils peuvent également être utilisés pour lancer quelques avions qui jouent le rôle d'ennemis pendant les exercices de combats aériens.

Pour qu'elles puissent jouer ce rôle, il faudrait améliorer les installations existantes dans ces trois (3) villes. Il faudrait par exemple prolonger les pistes, établir des systèmes de ravitaillement et peut-être construire un certain nombre de logements.

Le groupe de travail cherche surtout à établir le centre d'entraînement de l'OTAN, dans la zone d'entraînement du nord. La zone d'entraînement du sud, telle qu'elle existe à l'heure actuelle continuerait d'être utilisée pour des vols à basse altitude.

En conclusion, je dois souligner que les projets d'expansion qui ont été étudiés et dont on a discutés jusqu'ici, sont fondés sur l'hypothèse de la construction par l'OTAN d'un grand centre d'entraînement. Cependant, tous les pays font face actuellement à des difficultés économiques et à des restrictions budgétaires. Et les programmes militaires comme celui-ci ne sont pas épargnés.

Lorsque les plans détaillés seront disponibles et que l'on aura réglé la question du financement, on aura une meilleure idée de ce pourrait être l'avenir des vols d'entraînement militaire au Labrador et au Québec. Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs de m'avoir accordé votre attention. Maintenant, le major McCabe et moi, nous sommes prêts à répondre à vos questions sur la présentation ou sur les propositions à l'étude. Et nous serons aussi à votre disposition durant la pause. Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Major. Ladies and gentlemen, again, I would ask that if anyone cares to ask a question, would you please use one of the microphones on the floor and please state your name for the record before you put your question. Are there any questions concerning the nature of the Project?

If not, then, as I said before, we will now call a break in the meeting of approximately 15 minutes, perhaps, during which you are welcome to speak to any of us and look at the maps at the side to familiarize yourself with the area of the Project. I understand that there is coffee available outside, and we will come back in about 15-20 minutes. Thank you very much.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now proceed to hear from the intervenors who have indicated that they wish to speak to the Panel today. Our first speaker will be Madam Josee Mailhot, and if she is ready I would ask her to be seated at the table and to proceed.

MME JOSEE MAILHOT: Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Commissaires, ethnologue, ethno-linguiste et américaniste de profession, c'est à titre personnel que je m'adresse à la présente Commission.

Depuis vingt (20) ans, mes travaux ont porté principalement sur l'histoire, la culture et la langue des montagnais qui se désignent eux-mêmes par le terme Innut. J'ai effectué de nombreux et parfois longs séjours dans plusieurs de leur communauté, aussi bien au Labrador qu'au Québec. J'ai eu, avec des Montagnais de toutes les générations, d'innombrables conversations sur le sujet de leur histoire. Et j'ai suivi de près au cours de vingt (20) dernières années l'évolution de leur situation collective.

Je sympathise avec la position des Montagnais mais loin de moi l'idée de me substituer ici à eux ou de parler en leur nom. Peut-être pourrais-je toutefois en ma qualité d'observatrice et d'analyste des phénomènes socio-culturels, apporter un éclairage différent sur leur position en tentant de la situer dans un cadre qui transcende les enjeux immédiatement apparents de la question.

Les montagnais, ils l'ont fait savoir clairement, non seulement s'opposent au projet de construction d'un centre d'entraînement de l'OTAN à Goose Bay mais réclament l'arrêt immédiat des

Mailhot, Sub.

exercices de vols qui se déroulent présentement au dessus du territoire du Québec et du Labrador. Cette position n'a, à la vérité, rien pour étonner. Les Montagnais n'ont aucune raison d'être favorables à ce genre d'entreprise. Ils ne s'identifient nullement à la théorie de la défense militaire qui est prônée par le promoteur; ils n'ont aucun bénéfice matériel à en attendre et l'accroissement des opérations militaires qui sont déjà engagées dans le territoire, ne fera qu'accroître leurs ennuis.

Mais il faudrait peut-être comprendre les raisons profondes pour lesquelles ils sont si catégoriquement opposés au déroulement d'opérations militaires dans l'intérieur de la péninsule Québec-Labrador.

Serait-ce en vertu d'une tradition de résistance au changement,d'une volonté de faire obstruction à toute initiative provenant des euro-canadiens. Si l'on interroge l'histoire, forcé de constater que de profonds changements sont survenus chez les Montagnais depuis trois siècles et demi (3 1/2). Leur stratégie générale semble avoir été au contraire, de s'adapter à ces changements. Ils ont réagi favorablement au développement du commerce des fourrures. Ils ont composé avec l'installation de colons dans la Vallée du St-Laurent et avec la présence saisonnière de pêcheurs sur les côtes et par la suite, avec la naissance graduelle d'éta-

Mailhot, Sub.

blissements le long des littoraux; ils se sont adaptés à la création de villages qui leur étaient destinés, où étaient désormais disponibles des habitations permanentes, des écoles, des soins de santé, des services administratifs. Ils ne se sont opposés ni à l'avènement de l'école, ni à l'usage d'une langue étrangère, la preuve étant qu'ils sont en voie rapide de scolarisation et de bilinguisation. Et ils ont adopté depuis longtemps une nouvelle religion.

Mais si l'on examine leur histoire des deux (2) derniers siècles, on constate que les Montagnais ont protesté énergiquement à un certain nombre d'occasions qui sont facilement identifiables.

Au courant du dix-neuvième (19e) siècle, ils ont à plusieurs reprises fait d'énergiques représentations auprès des autorités, quand les pression de la colonisation dans la région du Saguenay Lac St-Jean étaient en voie de les déposséder de leurs terres. Quand, quelques années plus tard, le développement de la haute Côte Nord menaçait de les priver de l'accès aux ressources marines essentielles à leur survie. Puis de nouveau, quand l'attribution de privilèges exclusifs à des compagnies a sévèrement restreint l'exercice de leur droit de pêche au saumon sur les rivières de la Côte Nord. Les événements survenus à l'embouchure de la Rivière Moisie et de la Natashquan, au milieu

Mailhot, Sub.

des années mil neuf cent soixante-dix (1970), était la répétition du même scénario. Les Montagnais protestaient parce qu'on voulait les écarter de la gérance de leurs rivières et du contrôle de cette ressource essentielle qu'est le saumon.

Et ils protestent par tous les moyens chaque fois que par l'application étroite d'un règlement de chasse et pêche, on tente de leur interdire l'accès à des ressources dont ils ont dépendu depuis des siècles pour leur subsistance et sur lesquelles ils estiment,à juste titre, avoir des droits.

Le fait que les Montagnais protestent à présent contre les opérations militaires qui se déroulent à l'intérieur de la péninsule Québec-Labrador, s'inscrit en continuité parfaite avec les événements passés. De tout temps, ils ont offert une grande résistance à la négation ou à l'empiètement de leurs droits territoriaux.

En dépit de cette résistance, le tableau de l'occupation territoriale par les Montagnais contemporains est passablement différent de celui qu'il était au début du dix-septimème (17e) siècle. On sait que les Montagnais d'alors pratiquaient le nomadisme à une très grande échelle.

Occupant principalement la péninsule Québec-Labrador, ils fréquentaient régulièrement des îles situées dans le fleuve St-Laurent et une

Mailhot, Sub.

portion de la péninsule gaspésienne et probablement même l'île de Terre-Neuve. On sait également qu'ils exploitaient aussi bien les ressources des littoraux que celles de l'intérieur des terres. Mais avec l'accroîssement de la présence des Européens sur les littoraux, l'espace disponible aux Montagnais s'est considérablement rétrécit.

La circulation des individus sur le territoire s'est graduellement modifiée au cours des siècles. Jusqu'à il y a une centaine d'années, les compagnies marchandes devaient opérer des postes de traite à l'intérieur des terre parce qu'une proportion importante des Montagnais vivaient exclusivement dans l'arrière-pays.

Quand les compagnies ont éventuellement concentré leurs opérations sur le littoral ou au bord des grandes nappes d'eau, les Montagnais de l'intérieur ont modifié leur cycle annuel en fonction de la dichotomie littorale versus arrières-pays, allant et venant entre ses deux (2) pôles, selon un cycle annuel qui leur permettait à la fois de poursuivre leurs activités à l'intérieur des terres et de bénéficier des avantages du commerce et du christianisme qui leur étaient dispensés le long des grandes voies de communication de l'époque.

La période passée à la Côte qui était d'abord très brève, s'est progressivement allongée à mesure que des services nouveaux furent

Mailhot, Sub.

disponibles à l'emplacement initial des postes de traite et des missions.

Avec l'attrait qu'a représenté l'arrivée de missionnaires résidants, les Montagnais ont commencé à revenir aux postes de traite pour la période de Noël, morcelant ainsi leur cycle annuel en deux (2) saisons, l'une d'automne et l'une d'hiver.

Puis, avec la construction de maisons et l'ouverture d'écoles et de pensionnats, de véritables communautés ont été peu à peu créées ou l'état et l'Église espéraient les sédentariser une fois pour toutes.

Mais vingt (20), trente (30) ans plus tard, on constate que malgré ces pressions, les Montagnais ne sont pas complètement sédentarisés et ne se sont pas détournés de leurs activités de chasse et de pêche à l'intérieur des terres.

Dans toutes les communautés, il existe une proportion considérable de la population qui maintient envers et malgré tout ses liens avec les territoires de l'intérieur. Si de rares familles y passent à toutes fins pratiques l'année entière, la plupart y séjournent pour la saison d'automne et de nouveau pour la saison d'hiver, alors que d'autres y font des séjours plus brefs mais répétés. D'autres encore, ne s'y rendent que pour un événement particulier,comme la chasse aux caribous ou

Mailhot, Sub.

la chasse à l'outarde. Récemment, l'intérieur des terres est aussi devenu un lieu privilégié pour la tenue de manifestations collective d'ordre social ou religieux qui comporte une importante dimension symbolique.

On assiste donc depuis quelques années à un mouvement de valorisation de la vie à l'intérieur des terres. Et le taux de fréquentation de l'arrière pays est à présent plus élevé qu'il ne l'a été au cours des dix (10) dernières années. Des programmes ont été mis sur pied pour favoriser le séjour des familles en forêt; des modifications sont faites au calendrier scolaire; des projets sont mis sur pied dans le cadre de l'école pour initier les adolescents aux techniques nécessaires à la vie loin du village.

Ce mouvement constitue, à mon avis, une sérieuse remise en question par les intéressés eux-mêmes du mythe de leur intégration dans la société globale. Il est, à n'en pas douter, le résultat d'une déception éprouvée par plusieurs par rapport à la vie sédentaire dans les communautés.

Bien que les services dispensés dans ces communautés aient contribué à améliorer leur sort, de trop nombreux Montagnais y font encore l'expérience du chômage, de conditions sanitaires insuffisantes, de conditions de logement difficiles, du coût élevé de la vie et par conséquent, d'une mauvaise alimentation, de l'échec scolaire, de la discrimination raciale.

Dans l'esprit des Montagnais, il existe une dichotomie fondamentale qui leur fournit un schéma de perception et d'interprétation de leur situation actuelle. Dans tous les dialectes de la langue montagnaise, il existe une opposition entre uinipekut, c'est ce qui signifie le littoral et nutshimit, ce qui signifie l'intérieur des terres, l'arrière-pays. Le littoral est le domaine des euro-canadiens; c'est là qu'ils sont établis, c'est là que sont diponibles leurs institutions, leurs services, leur technologie, que règne leur culture et c'est là qu'ont été construits les villages destinés aux Montagnais.

Tandis que l'arrière-pays est le domaine propre des Montagnais. Le lieu où peut s'exercer librement leur propre culture. Même si les Montagnais vivent à présent une bonne partie de l'année dans la zone appelée Uinipekut, tous s'accordent à dire que c'est à l'intérieur des terres nutshimit que se trouve la meilleure qualité de vie.

L'utilisation que font actuellement les Montagnais de leur territoire, est bien entendu tributaire de l'histoire. Elle n'est pas identique à ce qu'elle était ni au dix-septième (17e) siècle, ni au milieu du dix-neuvième (19e) siècle, ni non plus au début des années mil neuf cent cinquante (1950). Mais, elle n'est pas moins réelle.

Mailhot, Sub.

Même si les modalités de fréquentation de l'arrière-pays n'ont cessé de se modifier au cours des siècles pour s'ajuster à toutes les innovations qu'ont été l'installation d'étrangers sur le pourtour de leur territoire traditionnel, les changements technologiques dans le domaine des transports et des communications. La création de communauté permanente et la mise en place de services par l'état. Il semble y avoir une chose que les Montagnais veulent véritablement, c'est de pouvoir continuer à leur guise à aller vivre dans l'arrière-pays,quand bon leur semble, pour des périodes plus ou moins longues qu'ils devraient d'ailleurs être les seuls à déterminer, en fonction de leurs propres intérêts. De pouvoir y emmener femmes et enfants, d'y vivrent sous la tente par petites unités sociales, basées sur des liens de parenté; d'y faire leur bois, d'y chasser et d'y pêcher pour se nourrir, d'y cuisiner à la manière indienne sur un petit poêle à bois. D'y avoir une diète à base de gibier plutôt qu'à base de féculent. De n'y entendre et de n'y parler que leur propre langue, d'y enseigner eux-mêmes à leurs enfants et d'y raconter leurs propres histoires et leurs propres croyances.

De reprendre contact avec ce qu'ils appellent dans leur langue innussi, c'est-à-dire la Terre Innu, le Territoire Montagnais.

Mailhot, Sub.

C'est cela que les Montagnais, à la fins du vingtième (20e) siècle identifient comme étant leur propre culture et c'est à cela qu'ils se disent profondément attachés.

Car, c'est en ayant la possibilité de continuer de vivre par période leur vie quotidienne dans l'intérieur des terres, loin des établissements permanents, loin de leurs voisins euro-canadiens, loins des institutions, des missionnaires, des enseignants, des administrateurs; sans électricité, ni télévision mais équipés de radios qui leur permettent de communiquer d'un camp à l'autre et de parer aux urgences médicales. En prenant congé des tensions générées par la vie en communauté et par les problèmes de désintégration sociale, de désoeuvrement et d'alcoolisme. Et en échappant pour un temps à la pauvreté matérielle qui est le lot de certaines de leurs communautés, c'est en ayant cette possibilité, dis-je, qu'ils retrouvent l'essence de leur identité. Une identité qui ne peut, dans leur esprit, être confondue avec l'identité canadienne ou québécoise ou terre-neuvienne.

Ils ont, avec raison, la conviction que si cette possibilité leur était enlevée, ils ne seraient plus rien. Ils seraient un peuple réduit, conquis, qu'on aura réussi à déposséder de tout et qui n'aura par conséquent rien à léguer aux générations futures.

Mailhot, Sub.

Si dans le cas qui nous occupe ici, les protestations des Montagnais sont si véhémentes et si organisées, c'est qu'ils ont la conviction que l'accroissement ou même le maintien des opérations militaires au Québec et au Labrador, les coupera définitivement de l'arrière-pays.

Non pas parce qu'on leur en aura formellement interdit l'accès mais parce que l'intérieur des terres sera devenu si invivable à leurs yeux, qu'ils seront forcés d'en abandonner d'eux-mêmes la fréquentation.

Puisqu'ils en sont depuis des temps immémoriaux, les usagers et les habitants, c'est à eux qu'il revient de juger si la vie dans l'intérieur des terres est encore acceptable ou non. Ils disent pour l'avoir expérimenté depuis quelques années que déjà, à cause des vols en rase-mottes, la qualité de vie à l'intérieur des terres est dégradée. Et ils ne voient pas comment ils pourraient s'en arranger.

Comment pourront-ils en effet, s'arranger éventuellement de l'accroissement considérable des vols d'entraînement, de bang supersoniques fréquents, d'exercices de bombardement et de combats aériens simulés. J'ai la conviction que si les Montagnais ne trouvent plus dans l'arrière-pays la qualité de vie qu'ils ont toujours associée à l'intérieur des terre, ils en abandonneront

Mailhot, Sub.

effectivement la fréquentation. Si donc, ils disent que selon leur évaluation, les opérations militaires rendent la vie à l'intérieur des terres de plus en plus difficile, je suis d'avis qu'il faille les prendre très au sérieux.

Si les Montagnais nous disent d'autre part que depuis la tenue des vols en rase-mottes, ils observent toutes sortes d'indices de la dégradation du milieu naturel, j'estime qu'il ne faut pas douter de leur capacité à observer des phénomènes dans un environnement qui leur est plus familier qu'à aucun d'entre nous.

Les Montagnais, c'est un fait historique, sont les descendants d'hommes et de femmes qui se sont adaptés à l'environnement subartique, il y a des milliers d'années. Les connaissances que détiennent par héritage culturel les Montagnais contemporains sur la faune, la flore, la physiographie, les réseaux hydrographiques de l'intérieur de la péninsule Québec-Labrador, sont le résultat cumulatif de l'expérience de centaines de générations.

Grâce aux liens privilégiés que les Montagnais n'ont jamais cessé d'entretenir avec cet environnement, ces connaissances sont demeurées vives jusqu'à maintenant. Il existe parmi eux, des individus dont on pourrait dire que la seule profession est d'être des spécialistes de l'envi-

Mailhot, Sub.

ronnement subartique.

Donc, les Montagnais paient aujourd'hui un coût social élevé pour la grande tolérance aux changements dont ils ont fait preuve par le passé. Le fait de continuer à occuper l'intérieur de la péninsule Québec-Labrador et la condition essentielle de leur survivance comme peuple, met le maintien d'une certaine qualité de vie,qui est elle-même liée à la sauvegarde d'une certaine qualité de l'environnement, est une condition sine qua non de leur fréquentation de ce territoire.

Par conséquent, devant les opérations militaires qui se déroulent dans l'arrière-pays du Québec et du Labrador, je partage leurs inquiétudes quant à l'avenir de ce territoire et quand à leur devenir comme peuple autochtone.

Messieurs les Commissaires, merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Madame Mailhot. Would any member of the Panel care to make a comment or ask a question of the speaker?

MR. JOHN HICKEY: My name is John Hickey, and I am a resident of Happy Valley-Goose Bay. You say that the Innu people, having lived in the communities of Davis Inlet and worked in Sheshatshit, there were a couple of things that you made reference to and I just wanted to question you on.

You said that the rate of unemployment, poor nutrition and poor housing was very evident there today; is that correct?

MME. MAILHOT: J'ai immédiatement une correction, Monsieur, mon ... je voudrais faire une mise au point immédiatement. Vous avez dû remarquer que ma présentation ne porte pas spécifiquement sur la communauté de Sheshatshit ou celle de Davis Inlet.

J'ai traité de la situation des Montagnais dans leur ensemble.

MR. HICKEY: As far as the Montagnais in Labrador are concerned, the housing, I will tell you, in Davis Inlet is better than any other community on the Labrador coast, and that is very evident with the new housing program which the Provincial Government put in place there this year, with new electrical services, education, readily available to the Innu people; also, medical facilities very readily available to the Innu people. Nutrition, we have a government store in Davis Inlet, Sheshatshit, and Innu people have all the nutritional value that they need.

You say that the Innu people wish to trap and catch fur off the land. I ask you the question: How much fur in the past do you know, as you said you lived with the Innu people, have you seen the Innu take off the land as far as revenue to buy food and clothing.

PAR MADAME MAILHOT: Je ferai une autre mise au point, Monsieur, jamais dans ma présentation, je n'ai dit que les gens voulaient trapper de la fourrure pour acheter de la nourriture au magasin.

J'ai dit, plus spécifiquement que ce que les Montagnais souhaitent, c'est de vivre dans l'intérieur des terres, ce qui implique une foule d'activités. Et je ne restreins pas du tout leur désir à celui d'attraper et de trapper et d'être insérés dans l'économie de la chasse à la fourrure, ce n'est pas de ça dont il est question. Je crois que ma présentation a été assez claire sur ce point.

MR. HICKEY: You said the Innu want to get away from schools, electricity, telephone, that type of thing. Would you say that that is a fair assessment of the majority of the Innu people?

MME MAILHOT: Là encore, je vous répondrai en faisant une mise au point. Je n'ai pas fait cette affirmation comme s'appliquant à l'ensemble des Innut et s'appliquant à la totalité de l'année.

Ce que j'ai dit, c'est que proportion considérable d'entre aux, souhaitent par période vivre sans électricité, sans téléphone, loin de l'école, loin de l'église et loin des institutions euro-canadiennes. Mais bien sûr, aux autres moments

de l'année, ils vivront dans leur communauté comme ils le font maintenant.

MR. HICKEY: Who is stopping them?

MME MAILHOT: De quoi exactement?

MR. HICKEY: Stopping them from going into the bush and doing the things they want to do without electricity, schools, education.

MME MAILHOT: Et je répondrai à cela qu'en ce moment, il y a quelque chose d'important qui les en empêche ou en tout cas, qui met en péril leurs projets, ce sont les opérations militaires qui se déroulent dans l'intérieur des terres, au Québec et au Labrador.

MR. HICKEY: Surprising enough, the low level flying in Labrador has been taking place, as we heard from the military this morning, since the 1950s to the 1980s, and the Innu people have only, very recently, been opposed to low level flying. It was not an issue during the fifties to eighties, and they did not seem to be concerned about it then. All of a sudden it is quite a big issue.

Considering that we have 110 thousand square miles in Labrador, and I understand that the military have agreed to stop low level in areas if the Innu request that they will have their camps in those areas.

MADAME MAILHOT: Je crois que le problème est plus fondamental, plus profond et généralisé que ça. Et je m'objecte personnellement au fait que vous essayez de restreindre le problème uniquement à la communauté de Sheshatshit.

Les Montagnais qui sont affectés par ces opérations militaires, dépassent largement le cadre de la communauté de Sheshatshit. Il y a des communautés dela Basse Côte Nord du St-Laurent qui sont encore davantage affectées par ces vols et dont les territoires sont situés au Québec.

Et pour répondre à un autre de vos arguments, je ne crois pas savoir qu'il y ait eu des vols en rase-mottes avant mil neuf cent soixante-dix-neuf (1979) dans ce territoire. Est-ce que je me trompe là-dessus, peut-être que Messieurs les Commissaires peuvent nous éclairer sur cette question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe to attempt to clarify the situation, prior to 1979 or 1980 there were flights by military aircraft, all of which occurred at altitudes above 500 feet. Is that correct?

MAJOR McCABE: No, they are lower than that.

MR. HICKEY: I have lived there all my life and I can assure you that the Falcon bombers flew below 500 feet.

MME. MAILHOT: Volaient-ils aussi bas qu'à trente (30), cinquante (50) mètres au dessus du sol? Et est-ce que la fréquence des vols était aussi importante qu'elle ne l'est maintenant?

MR. HICKEY: From all information that we have, and from living in the region, we certainly know that the Falcon bombers did their low level reconnaissance over Labrador and it was much the same as what the German Air Force is doing today.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wonder if somebody else here would like to clarify for the record, with some authoriative statement.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL JOHN DAVID: **There were two types** of extensive operations in Labrador over the years. The Vulcan operation was a day-night operation, low level, throughout the greater Labrador/Quebec peninsula. In poor weather conditions and in limited flight conditions they operated above 500 feet, similar to the way the fighters operate today. In good weather conditions, I believe they operated to as as low as 250 feet and, perhaps, on occasion, lower.

But, of greater significance in those days was the air defence operation, which was a North American air defence, and there was considerable supersonic flying going on and supersonic training in the immediate area, both high level and to altitudes below 10,000 feet on occasions on major exercises, and that has continued even through to today.

MME MAILHOT: Excusez-moi, je voudrais vous demander une précision, ces opérations donc datent des années cinquante (50), si j'ai bien compris ou sont-elles plus récentes, datant de soixante-dix-neuf ('79)?

COLONEL DAVID: I did not have my earphone on.

MR. WILKINSON: What she is saying, really, is this something that has been going on since the 1950s or --

COLONEL DAVID: We had a more extensive air defence operation going on until the late seventies, and we have had a reduced air defence operation since then, except on an annual basis with major exercises.

The number of sorties that the Royal Air Force committed in those days at low level is not in proportion whatsoever to today's operation. The exact statistics I do not have but it certainly is a smaller percentage of the number of sorties that are flown today.

MME. MAILHOT: Par comparaison aux années cinquante ('50)?

COLONEL DAVID: Compared to the 1950s we have extensive increase in dedicated low level flying, but on the other hand we have had a considerable reduction in supersonic flying.

MME. MAILHOT: Alors, pour répondre direct, à la lumière de ces nouvelles dônnées, ce dont les Montagnais font l'expérience dans leur séjour à l'intérieur des terres, ce sont les vols à basse altitude bien sûr, à une fréquence qui est devenue maintenant assez importante.

MR. HICKEY: I just would like to say in closing, having lived in the community of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, I suggest to you that we have met with the Innu people and we certainly see that they have some concerns as to their land claims, and rightly so. Nobody is questioning that.

We also feel as far as the military development at Goose Bay at the present time, that the Innu people and their leadership -- certain members of their leadership, because the Innu people are not -- when I have spoken to them -- unanimous as to the way they want to develop. They are, in Labrador, at the present time looking to put a development corporation in place, as the Inuit have done at Nain to harvest the George River caribou herd. The community of Davis Inlet, their leadership, just to fill you in further, have neither condoned the low level flying and military operations at Goose Bay, and have chosen to basically sit on the fence in that respect.

We see the peace movement using the Innu people to further their own goals. I can assure you that when the land claims issue is addressed by government and when the Innu people do put a concrete proposal on land claims to government, that the community of Happy Valley-Goose Bay will support them. Right now we see it as a social problem within the Innu community, and the social problem is getting mixed up with the military, and the military issues and the military development. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hickey, and, again, thank you Madam Mailhot.

In the interest of drawing out good information, I decided not to attempt to cut short that discussion, and, in particular, since the other scheduled speaker for this morning is not present, again, I felt there was no hurry to cut short that discussion.

Now, since the other party scheduled to speak this morning has not appeared yet and will, I understand, be here this afternoon instead, we have some time left between now and the scheduled end of this morning's session if anybody else, who has not previously appeared, any group or individual, who has not previously appeared before this Panel in this series of meetings would care to say something, particularly if you would have some comment on the draft Guideline document which, as I said at the beginning, is the main purpose of these meetings, we would be pleased to hear from you now. Otherwise, I would be inclined to adjourn the session.

MS. CLARIS RUDKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am Claris Rudkowski,and I would like to have a few comments on behalf of myself, if I may.

PM

Rudkowski, Sub.

You must forgive me, I really do not have something prepared. It is rather impromptu and I made some notes as the previous presenter was speaking.

The Environmental Assessment Panel have now been conducting hearings since September and have gone from Nain, Labrador, to St. John's, Newfoundland, and from Fort Chimo, Quebec and now to Hull, and they have heard presentations from over 100 groups, who have used the hearings to protest everything from land claims to nuclear war and from social problems to defence policy.

The Panel has been praised for its perception of the issue, which is low level flying, and criticized for its phony mandate. It has been knocked for its procedures and cheered for its tolerance.

Now, to tell you a little of where I am coming from, I have legitimate claim to being a native of Labrador. The white part of my heritage can be traced back five generations, and I have also Innu and Inuit heritage and can be traced back for as long as the history of the indigenous peoples.

Having said that, my family settled in Sheshatshit 40 years ago before the Innu did, and as a consequence of that I have observed the evolution of the Innu in Sheshatshit and I feel can speak with some authority on that. As a matter of fact, my parents still live in Sheshatshit.

Rudkowski, Sub.

Now, having said that, I must say that I do have a great deal of sympathy for the Innu people. I understand what has happened to them and what is happening to them, but I think at the same time we cannot close our eyes and sit on our hands and wonder what we can do. I think instead we should be doing something constructive to help them out of the dilemna.

Probably one of the things is, one, to settle land claims. Two, I think it is unrealistic to think that they can go back to the land and forget about the world around them. The lady before me suggested that this is the way they should pursue life, but I think it is unrealistic to the degree that the church came in 200 years ago to minister to the Indians, and I think if anything had an impact on their culture then the church did in that they were insisting that they adopt Christian values and enter the white man's world. They were encouraged by the church at the beginning, and later on by succeeding governments, to become sedentary, to go to schools, to learn the English language for whatever area they happened to be in, and to take advantage of a wage economy.

They have been brought to this point now and they are hearing people tell them, no, you should not take advantage of a wage economy; you should go back to the land. Go back to the land! If you look at the history of living off the land, the land has not always been kind to the Innu. There have been times when game was scarce and the Innu suffered greatly from starvation and all sorts of other illnesses.

So, I am suggesting to you going back to the land is not all it is cracked up to be. Then, on the other hand, they have been brought to a point where some of the younger people do not really want to go back to the land, and this is something that we are not always hearing. The Innu people themselves are split on the issue. Some of them, like myself -- I have gone hunting at the age of 14 on my snowshoes and with a gun and with a game bag on my back, and I still like to go for a weekend or a day or so out in the woods, where there is tranquillity and the beauty of nature and all the rest of it, but it is something that we want to do for a weekend or for a day or whatever, but then come back and get our earnings and live a more comfortable life.

So, some of the younger people now, I was saying, have been brought to a point where (1) they have lost the skill to live off the land, and they have tasted, if you will, our white man's ways. They like to have a television. They like to have a warm cozy house and a good bed to sleep on, and they do not want to give that up to go strictly back to the land where they are sleeping on the ground, living in a tent, which is very romantic for you and I here in the white man's world to think

Rudkowski, Sub.

about but not all that comfortable. So, they do want to take advantage of a wage economy and pursue the back-to-land scenario on a weekend basis.

So, for anybody to suggest that the whole of the Innu people want to go back to the land is a falsity.

Having said that, I think I would like to continue on. The hearings were established to discuss the Guidelines that the Environmental Assessment Review Panel had set down, which very few of the groups utilized the opportunity to do. Most of them used the Guideline hearings to develop arguments against nuclear, military and low level flying, all under the guise of peace promotion, and this is another thing that I object to.

I feel very strongly that the peace activists groups and so on have latched on to this Innu concern for their own purposes and without really understanding the Innu people, or maybe not even caring very much as long as their own ends are met.

Some of the arguments raised by the protest groups as being direct effects of the low level flying are: One, the favourite one we hear, that the caribou herds are being disseminated. Exactly the opposite has occurred. During the period 1979-1986, figures given by survey biologists show a dramatic increase in the caribou population from 300,000 animals in 1979 to almost 800,000 in 1986. Since the feeding range has not significantly changed, nor the predator population decreased during that time, population numbers alone do not support the wild charges of massive dessimination of the herds.

We fully support and welcome the exhaustive studies, planned and ongoing, into this important aspect.

Hearing losses occur due to low level flying; another one we hear. It is interesting to note that this subject has lost its media appeal after a panel of independent medical experts was set up to examine the complaints and gathered evidence that ear drum puncture, as had been alleged to occur, was physically impossible, and the panel could find no one to come forward to be tested, even among the Innu. Hopefully, such demonstrations as we saw at Montreal with a ghetto blaster and the mime will not be impressionable.

Another one we keep constantly hearing is about the Innu population in what we call Labrador is around -- we keep hearing a number batted around of 10,000 people. The Innu population of Labrador, and Labrador is what I am familiar with, number 850 people. In Sheshatshit, the largest Innu community in Labrador, numbering 500 people; in Davis Inlet, which is on the coast of Labrador, there are 300, and then we have a breakaway band in Lobstick Lake, which is near Churchill Falls, which have another 50. The Montagnais-Naskapi people live in Sheshatshit near Goose Bay and Davis Inlet on the north coast as well as a small band at Lobstick in the interior, as I just mentioned.

The numbers are not 10,000 as the intervenors present to both the Panel and the media. Although numerically those of the Innu who protest low level flying are in an extreme minority position, they do have serious concerns which must be addressed.

These concerns, I believe, are greater than the issue of the presence of the military in Goose Bay: Specifically, a just and fair settlement of their land claims issue, and I urge the Panel to convey to both levels of government my deep desire to see the process and negotiation and just settlement be implemented with all the native groups of Labrador.

Facts have been placed before the public discounting the claims of groups oppposed to military activities in Labrador, that the caribou herds are being disseminated, that hearing losses have occurred, that the Innu population of Labrador is much greater than it really is, that the non-Innu of Labrador are opposed to land claims; all of which are untrue.

I note that these claims are dropped to be replaced with even more exotic arguments in the hope of terrifying the public through media hype. The latest in these is ionizing radiation. Such technological expressions are thrust out in the hope of gaining support from a frightened and technologically-ignorant public. Ionizing radiation emitted from training jets is only one-thousandth of that emitted from any marine radar installation aboard ships. The warning posted on aircraft to keep clear of the radar installation is no more ominous than the warning posted on the back of your television or microwave oven.

In Eastern Europe 200 million people have lived for decades under the most powerful radar systems in the world, lined up by the Native Allies and the Warsaw Pact countries. No problems of acne, loss of hair, or sexual impotence attribute to the presence of these radar have been documented.

The Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay has lived under a powerful radar station used by both military and civilian purposes ever since radar's discovery. None of us have had our brains fried and most of us, like elsewhere, produce healthy and happy children. Wild arguments couched in technilogical terms with the sole purpose of striking fear and terror in the hearts of the general public cannot go unchallenged.

Having said that, I want to say that I live in Labrador. I work there, and I will continue to develop and grow there, and I honestly -- my three children have been born there and I expect to be buried there, and I want to tell you I have a commitment to Labrador and I want to see what is

Rudkowski, Sub.

good for Labrador and for all people of Labrador, including myself, the Innu, the Inuit, and any transients who might come by. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Rudkowski. I think in all fairness we should ask if anyone would care to make a statement or pose a question to this speaker. Yes, sir, would you please use the microphone?

M. JACQUES COSTER: Moi, ce que je voudrais demander aux deux (2) intervenants qui habitent le Labrador et qui parlent d'ailleurs toujours de Sheshatshit, c'est, est-ce qu'ils connaissent les... les communautés par exemple de La Romaine, de Natashquan, de Mingan, de Sept-Iles, de St-Augustin. Et est-ce qu'ils savent de combien de population sont formées ces communautés ?

Ces vols militaires n'ont pas lieu qu'au Labrador et bien sûr pas au dessus de Happy Valley mais ils ont lieu au dessus des terrains de chasse des Montagnais de la Basse Côte Nord dont j'ai cité les communautés et ce n'est pas huit cents (800) personnes. Et si on implique en plus les communautés du sud Innuit du Québec, alors vous retomberez dans les cinq mille (5,000) qu'on a déjà affirmés.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: As I understand it, the low level flying does not take place over any settled communities. The Montagnais people live in communities in the coastal areas of the south shore of Quebec and in Labrador, and low level flying does not take place over any permanent settlements

If Innu are overflown, it would only happen if they are in the interior and they have not told the military where they are so that they can be avoided.

We are looking at a land here -- Labrador itself; if you look at Labrador itself, it is a land greater than the whole of Great Britain put together. We have 31,000 people in Labrador and you are not going to tell me that we cannot have low level flying along with a subsistence hunt, if you will, by the Innu. We can be living together.

MR. HICKEY: Just to address the monsieur over here, I would just like to remind him of a report which came out of Fort Chimo just a couple of weeks ago in which a journalist had gone in there and asked the people about the low level flying. The report that was sent back to Goose Bay is that we have not seen any low level flying but we are hearing a lot about it from the press at Goose Bay through CBC.

I think that is basically a very true statement. That is about the extent of low level flying in Quebec at the present is the information that is sent via air waves into Quebec as to what is

happening.

There is no low level flying, to my knowledge, in Quebec.

M. EDMOND MALEC: Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Commissaires, comme notre opposition et puis dans les rapports qu'on a soumis à la Commission, il est très bien dit que dans le rapport que les Montagnais de la Basse Côte Nord sont concernés.

On est quatre mille (4,000) qui se sont... que les vols militaires nous dérangent. Si les intervenants de... la Madame et le Monsieur, n'ont pas lu les rapports, ils liront très bien que ces rapports.. on ne parle pas à travers de notre chapeau.

Si les militaires ne nous dérangeraient pas, on ne s'y opposerait pas. J'aimerais bien apporter les précisions qu'ici comme à la Commission ce n'est pas une salle de débat ni... si quelqu'un peut très bien poser les questions pour préciser ou avoir plus de renseignements. Je ne pense pas que la Commission puisse tolérer une séance de débats ici, c'est seulement si des gens ont des précisions à apporter, ils aimeraient bien les apporter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Are there any other persons?

MADAME MAILHOT: Je voudrais seulement apporter une petite mise au point à certaines des affirmations de Madame. Ce dont il est questions pour les Innut , encore appelés les Montagnais, ce n'est pas de retourner dans le bois; ce n'est pas de retourner dans le bois puisqu'ils n'ont jamais quitté ces territoires, ils les ont occupés depuis des milliers d'années, en vertu de droits territoriaux qu'ils possèdent sur ces territoires.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions related to this last presentation?

M. ROBERT LANARIE: Je voudrais apporter, je pense une correction à ... Monsieur tantôt qui a mentionné qu'il n'y a pas de vols à basse altitude au Québec. Mais je crois que tout le plan de l'OTAN, c'est justement de prendre de grands territoires, un au nord de Schefferville qui empiète et sur le Labrador et sur le Québec et un autre grand territoire au Québec seulement près de la Basse Côte Nord, enfin, c'est le plan qu'on nous a présenté l'autre jour, je crois que la Commission devrait expliquer à Monsieur que c'est justement, ce dont on parle, ce sont les vols à basse altitude, à l'intérieur des terres et au Québec.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify what I said there, is that the low level flying which is taking place the Innu people are not in the bush during the summertime. All the knowledge we have is that the Innu people usually go in after the low level flying has stopped. So, I mean there is no low level flying taking place when the Innu people go into the bush in Quebec or Labrador in the fall and wintertime.

M. LANARIE: Je pense qu'on va s'argumenter longtemps, on va demander beaucoup de précisions ici.

Il me semble qu'on nous a déjà mentionné que les vols à basse altitude, c'était du mois d'avril à novembre, je crois, est-ce qu'on peut préciser ça, il me semble qu'on a déjà mentionné ça. Est-ce qu'il y a quelqu'un qui pourrait nous donner la saison des vols à basse altitude?

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe Major McCabe will respond to that.

MAJOR DAVID McCABE: That has been advertised as a season. However, historically the actual season itself, and I can use this year as an example -- the flying is generally finished by the beginning to the middle of October at the latest, and, again, the flights start possibly early as April but very little at that time. That is the extreme of the season, if you like.

ROBERT LANARIE: Alors, je présume que du mois d'avril au mois d'octobre, il n'y a aucun amérindien en forêt, si je comprends bien l'intervention de l'autre Monsieur ? Est-ce que... Bon, merci, est-ce que... peut-être que l'anthropologue qui a fait vingt (20) ans, elle pourrait peut-être nous donner les explications.

MADAME MAILHOT: Il y a certainement une période où les Innut et les avions à l'intérieur des terres risquent de se rencontrer et c'est tout le mois de septembre et le mois d'octobre. La période à laquelle les familles se mettent en route pour l'intérieur des terres, c'est le tout début septembre. Et je peux en témoigner, j'étais à Sheshatshit en septembre quatre-vingt-quatre ('84), j'y suis arrivée le quatre (4) et le village était presque désert, un nombre très important de familles étaient déjà toutes parties pour l'intérieur des terres.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

M. LANARIE: Je m'excuse, juste pour rajouter à ça, d'ailleurs, la Commission est allée à Sheshatshit en octobre, c'était le quinze (15) ou le seize (16) octobre qu'on était à Sheshatshit, j'étais là avec la Commission et il y a déjà beaucoup d'amérindiens à Sheshatshit qui étaient déjà partis en forêt. C'était le quinze (15) octobre de cette année.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no other questions or comments, I would again thank Mrs. Rudkowski for her presentation. There being no other scheduled speakers at this time, I suggest we adjourn this morning's session and we will begin again at 2:00 o'clock this afternoon. Thank you very much.

---Luncheon adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon, thank you for coming to the meeting. For those of you who were not here this morning, my name is David Barnes and I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, which has been appointed by the Minister of the Environment to conduct a public environmental review of certain existing and proposed military flying activities to be based at Goose Bay Labrador.

The main purpose of these meetings

is to hear comments on a draft document entitled "Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement", to be prepared by the proponent in this proposal, being the Department of National Defence.

At the beginning of the session this morning we presented a rather lengthy outline of the review of that draft document and of the Project, and we do not intend to repeat that presentation at this session. However, after we have heard from the scheduled speakers for this afternoon, the Panel would be quite willing to respond to questions from those who may not have been here this morning; questions concerning the process, and we have with us a representative of the Department of National Defence, who would be willing to respond to questions concerning the nature of the Project. So, when the time comes you will be quite welcome to ask those questions.

At this time then we will proceed with hearing from our scheduled speakers. The first, and I believe the only pre-registered speaker for this afternoon's session, is Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme. I believe we have two speakers who will be making that presentation and if they are ready I would invite them to proceed to the table at the other side of the room and carry on with their presentation.

M. GILLES TARDIF: Bonjour, mon nom est Gilles Tardif, je suis vice président au bureau international de la Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme.

Je vais brièvement vous expliquer un petit peu l'organisme que je représente et laisser la parole à ma collègue, Madame Francine Fournier qui est responsable de la mission d'observation qui a été effectuée au Labrador, plus principalement dans la région de Goose Bay.

La Fédération Internationale est un organisme non gouvernemental qui recrute ou qui regroupe à peu près une trentaine d'associations nationales, donc, de différents pays dans le monde, qui s'intéressent aux droits de l'homme et aux libertés. Elle a son siège social à Paris et elle est membre des Nations-Unies comme organisme non gouvernemental, du Conseil de l'Europe et de l'UNESCO, spécialement dans les Commissions, comités qui sont intéressés aux droits de l'homme.

La Fédération a comme principale activité d'exercer des missions d'observation soit judiciaires ou d'enquêtes qui sont requises par les différentes ligues ou associations internationales et ces missions sont acceptées au bureau international à Paris et puis diffusées dans les organes internationaux, commission de droit de l'homme de l'ONU, Conseil d'Europe pour diffusion et études et recommandations par nos représentants

Tardiff, Sub.

et les pays qui peuvent les réutiliser. C'est ainsi que la Ligue des Droits et Libertés du Québec, l'Association des Droits de l'Homme de Terre-Neuve appuyés par la Fédération Canadienne des Droits et Libertés, ont demandé à la Fédération Internationale de parrainer et mandater une mission d'observation au Labrador concernant spécialement les vols en basse altitude.

Cette mission a été autorisée en mai dernier, elle a été effectuée à cette époque et nous nous apprêtons à publier et diffuser le rapport final dans les jours ou les prochaines semaines qui viennent.

Sans plus tarder, j'aimerais laisser la parole à Madame Francine Fournier qui est consultante en droit de l'homme, qui a une expérience au Canada et au Québec, en particulier, en termes de protection,défense des droits et libertés.

Elle va vous présenter le mandat qui était dévolu à cette mission. Les personnes qui l'ont accompagnées dans l'enquête et les grandes lignes du rapport final qu'elle vous présentera verbalement puisque le document étant sous-presse, il sera diffusé plus tard.

MME FRANCINE FOURNIER: En effet, notre mission a porté sur l'examen des effets des vols en basse altitude au Labrador et nord-est du Québec. Dans le rapport que je ferai aujourd'hui, j'insisterai particulièrement sur nos observations et conclusions qui portent spécifiquement sur les questions environnementales puisque c'est l'objet de votre Commission.

À la requête, comme le disait mon collègue, à la requête du Conseil National de la Ligue des Droits et Libertés du Québec, une mission de la FIDH s'est rendue, les quatre (4) et cinq (5) mais quatre-vingt-six ('86) au Labrador et sur la Côte Nord du Québec, le nord-est du Québec pour y enquêter sur la situation du peuple Innu.

La Ligue a été saisie en effet de violation de droits fondamentaux affectant ces populations. Violation évoquée dans une résolution des délégués des premières nations du trente et un (31) octobre mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-cinq (1985) réunis pour statuer sur une déclaration du trente et un (31) mai mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-cinq (1985) du Conseil des représentants des communautés Innu annexée au rapport que vous verrez lorsqu'il sera publié.

La plainte reçue par la Ligue des Droits et Libertés vise plus particulièrement les conséquences des vols d'entraînement en rase-mottes

Fournier, Sub.

effectués par les forces aériennes militaires sur des territoires où les populations Innu campent en pratiquant leur mode de vie traditionnel.

En effet, la plainte fait état d'atteinte à l'intégrité physique et mentale et au mode de vie traditionnel des Innu, ainsi qu'aux droits ancestraux de ce peuple sur le territoire impliqué.

Les atteintes à l'intégrité physique et mentale se traduiraient - telle est la plainte - se traduiraient par des réactions de chocs, de troubles auditifs et par l'empoisonnement de l'environnement. Les atteintes au mode de vie traditionnel, dont les effets ultimes seraient la disparition de la culture Innu et donc de la collectivité Innu en tant que peuple, viendraient de l'empiètement des activités militaires sur les territoires de chasse dont l'utilisation fait partie intégrante du mode de vie Innu.

Ces empiètements entraîneraient une perturbation intolérable de la vie des familles séjournant dans les campements de chasse et de pêche et risqueraient même de provoquer l'abandon de ceux-ci.

De plus, le bruit et la pollution provenant des vols en basse altitude provoqueraient la fuite, la détérioration et peut-être l'extinction de la faune essentielle à l'existence autonome des

Fournier, Sub.

Innut . Enfin, les atteintes aux droits ancestraux sur le territoire, viendraient du fait que l'utilisation d'une partie des terres ancestrales Innu à partir de la base militaire de Goose Bay, s'est faite sans consultation ni autorisation du peuple Innu, bien que celui-ci n'est jamais cédé ce territoire et que ces revendications territoriales aient été acceptées pour négociation par le gouvernement fédéral. Alors, voici la plainte que nous avons reçue et que nous avons examinée.

Le mandat, donc, précisément que la mission d'observation a eu à rencontrer est le suivant:

> "Apprécier la situation des populations Innu qui se plaignent de troubles et de nuisances, qu'entraînent pour eux les installations militaires récemment implantées et qui à leurs dires, mettent profondément en péril l'exercice de leur mode de vie traditionnel".

Avant de vous donner les grandes lignes de notre observation, des résultats de notre observation, je vous rappelle ou vous indique rapidement la composition de la mission qui s'est produite donc au Labrador et au nord-est du Québec.

Alors, la mission était composée de cinq (5) membres, Monsieur Léo Aisenstein de nationalité française, qui est avocat à la Cour de Paris;

Fournier, Sub.

Monsieur Richard Bargen de nationalité canadienne, résidant et exerçant... médecin exerçant dans le Nevada; moi-même, politicologue, ancienne présidente de la Commission des Droits de la Personne du Québec; Monseigneur Jules Leguerrier de nationalité canadienne, évêque de Moosenee en Ontario et Président du Comité de la Pastorale des Indiens du Québec et membre de la Commission des Affaires Sociales des Évêques du Québec. Et Madame Danièle Petit, de nationalité française, membre du Bureau de la Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme.

Pour ce qui est du déroulement de la mission, je l'indique rapidement, nous nous sommes rendus au Labrador et nous avons résidé et retenu des témoignages des populations à Sheshatshit, à Goose Bay, à Happy Valley ainsi qu'à La Romaine.

Nous avons aussi séjourné dans des camps de chasse et de pêche, le camp du Lac Andrew et le camp de Black Lake. Nous avons, à cette occasion, interrogé encore une fois et obtenu des renseignements et des témoignages de la part de différents représentants des populations.

Nous avons parlé au maire de Happy Valley, nous avons parlé aux représentants et nous avons écouté les représentants de la Chambre de commerce de Happy Valley, Goose Bay. Nous avons aussi parlé avec les représentants et les autorités de la base militaire. Nous avons parlé avec les

Fournier, Sub.

représentants des communautés Innu du Labrador et avec les représentants des communautés Innu et Montagnaises de La Romaine et de St-Augustin.

Nous avons parlé à la fois à des personnes en poste d'autorité et à des personnes ordinaires, si vous voulez, aux personnes résidant dans ces différents endroits.

Et c'est suite à ces témoignages et à notre propre observation que les observations suivantes et les conclusions suivantes ont été faites. Je vous indique dans les grandes lignes donc les résultats de notre observation.

Encore une fois, le mandat de la mission envoyée sur le terrain par la Fédération Internationale était d'enquêter sur les accusations de violation des droits de la personne, portées par les Innut du Labrador et du Québec. Selon la requête adressée à la Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme, ces violations proviennent des survols à basse altitude du territoire Innu par des avions militaires à réaction.

Les conclusions finales de la mission et la description des principaux problèmes que soulève la question, apparaissent ci-après; les conclusions et la description des problèmes reposent sur les témoignages recueillis par la mission et sur les observations qu'elle a faite sur le terrain.

Conclusions donc, premièrement:

Fournier, Sub.

"Les activités d'entraînement militaire aérien des forces du Canada et de l'OTAN violent certains droits naturels et légaux, reconnus internationalement des Innut du Labrador et du Québec .

Deuxièmement: Le survol à basse altitude par des avions militaires à réactions des deux (2) grandes zones d'entraînement militaire et du territoire compris entre elles, dans le Labrador et dans le Québec, engendrent des conditions nuisibles au bien-être physique, mental et culturel d'au moins une partie de la population Innu.

Cette conclusion vaut pour les droits collectifs et individuels de façon générale, indépendamment du jugement qu'on pourrait porter sur les problèmes afférents, tels les droits territoriaux des autochtones, les questions de militarisation et de paix et la santé économique de la région de Goose Bay et de Happy Valley."

Principaux problèmes afférents,

premièrement: "La population de Goose Bay et de

Fournier, Sub.

Happy Valley dépend économiquement de l'exploitation de la base militaire de Goose Bay.

Les habitants de la région considèrent que l'existence de la base et son expansion éventuelle sont essentielles à leur survivance.

Les habitants des municipalités ont confiance que tous les problèmes que posent les opérations militaires actuelles et futures peuvent être réglées.

Deuxièmement: Les populations, blanche et Innu, sont depuis quelques années en rupture de communication.

Le manque de communication accentué par les tensions résultant des problèmes mentionnés plus haut, créent un climat propice à la violence.

Les autorités gouvernementales ne semblent pas avoir pris conscience de la gravité de la situation.

Troisièmement: La situation des Innut du Labrador et du Québec a suscité beaucoup d'intérêt hors du Labrador et du Québec étant donné la préoccupation générale pour les questions comme les droits des autochtones, la

Fournier, Sub.

militarisation du Grand Nord et la paix. La mission reconnaît sans plus de commentaires l'importance et l'étendue de ces préoccupations, aussi bien chez les blancs que chez les Innut .

Quatrièmement: On s'inquiète de façon générale de l'intégrité du processus écologique, de l'imprécision des données sur l'impact futur des opérations militaires, c'est-à-dire des vols supersoniques et de la qualité des renseignements donnés au public par plusieurs des parties en cause.

Cinquièmement: Les médias ont contribué à faire connaître les problèmes du Labrador et de la région nord-est du Québec. Les Innut en particulier se sont servis des médias pour faire part de leurs inquiétudes à une auditoire plus vaste. La liberté de parole s'exerce donc pleinement. Mais certaines des parties en cause reprochent aux médias d'offrir un service de manchette sans se donner la peine d'approfondir suffisamment le problème et d'en rendre compte fidèlement.

Fournier, Sub.

Sixièmement: Les Innut s'inquiètent des répercussions des opérations militaires actuelles et futures sur leurs revendicationsterritoriales et sur les conditions de la faune, sur l'utilisation de leur territoire à des fins militaires, ainsi de suite.

Les droits aériens feront désormais partie de la négociation des revendications territoriales des autochtones au même titre que les droits sur la terre et sur l'eau. Les parties concernées d'ores et déjà devraient se préparer à cette nouvelle question.

Huitièmement (sic), les conflits de juridiction entre gouvernements fédérals et provinciaux risquent de retarder le règlement du problème au détriment de toutes les parties en cause.

Recommandation: Premièrement, il faut proposer aux Innut,un programme satisfaisant de cessation de survol à basse altitude de leurs chasseurs, de leurs trappeurs et de leurs campements. Ce programme doit être mis en oeuvre localement, jusqu'à ce que

Fournier, Sub.

les problèmes qui y sont reliés à commencer par les revendications territoriales des autochtones soient réglées.

Deuxièmement: La mission a observé qu'il existe un écheveau complexe de problèmes qui plongent leurs racines dans l'histoire. Il serait logique de charger une Commission, de faire enquête sur la situation et de faire des recommandations précises avant d'étendre les opérations militaires dans la région de Goose Bay.

Troisièmement: La situation se dégrade du point de vue des Innut . La population blanche perçoit les efforts d'auto-détermination des Innut comme une menace à sa sécurité économique. La peur, la méfiance et l'incompréhension pourraient déboucher sur la violence. Le problème Innu ne peut se régler à partir d'initiatives exclusivement locales ou provinciales. Les autorités fédérales doivent prendre dès maintenant des mesures pour désamorcer la situation.

Quatrièmement: Pour hâter la solution du problème, il faut rétablir les

Fournier, Sub.

> lignes de communication. Il faut parallèlement disposer de la source de conflit que constituent les revendications territoriales des Innut , régler le problème des survols et assurer la population blanche d'un avenir économique stable, ne reposant pas forcément sur les activités militaires.
>
> Pour en arriver rapidement à une solution juste et satisfaisante, il faut traiter ces trois (3) questions simultanément et promptement."

Voici les conclusions générales de notre rapport. Je vais indiquer, donner quelques indications supplémentaires concernant les raisons de nos conclusions portant sur les atteintes à l'intégrité physique et mentale et aux atteintes sur la culture et le mode de vie Innu. Et donc.. et sur l'environnement donc du peuple Innu.

Le sommaire des... si je vous résume la situation en ce qui concerne nos observations reliées aux atteintes à l'intégrité physique et mentale, nous pouvons dire de la façon suivante. Le bruit d'impact de nature alléatoire est mal suporté par les êtres humains. Bon, les explications du bruit d'impact, je crois, doivent vous être assez familières, il s'agit du bruit qui apparaît soudai-

Fournier, Sub.

nement lors du passage du survol d'avionsen basse altitude et qui provoque chez les êtres humains et on peut le déduire, chez les animaux, des réactions de choc et de saisissement.

Le survol en basse altitude d'avions à réaction, génère des bruits d'impact qui sont suffisamment importants pour provoquer de façon soutenue une réaction de saisissement chez les êtres humains exposés.

Il existe une forte preuve scientifique à l'effet que les êtres humains ne devraient pas être exposés à des assauts répétés de cette nature, à cause de leur impact négatif sur leur bien-être physique, mental et social. Si les Innut ou qui que ce soit étaient exposés contre leur gré à des bruits de cette nature, il peut être affirmé catégoriquement qu'une telle exposition doit cesser, sinon les responsable de ce bruit doivent supporter le fardeau de causer un tort prévisible et inacceptable à d'autres êtres humains.

Le mécanisme précis pour prévoir le soulagement est la prérogative bien sûr de chacune des sociétés. Les vols en basse altitude, de plus, ne permettent pas la dispersion des émissions de gaz d'échappement. Dans cette région du Labrador et du Québec, les vols militaires d'entraînement en basse altitude produiront la part importante des polluants environnementaux.

Fournier, Sub.

Les impacts sur les êtres humains des émissions électro-magnétiques, provenant des avions et de bases de terre futures, doivent être évalués avec grand soin, ce qui ne semble pas être le fait actuellement, d'après les études ou les quelques rapports que nous avons pu lire sur la question qui avait déjà couvert le sujet.

Observation: Pour ce qui est des rapports des professionnels médicaux, nous n'avons pu entrer en communication qu'avec un seul médecin sur place, et ce médecin à North West River n'a été témoin d'aucun problème directement attribuable au bruit d'impact. Ce qui fait que dans sa pratique personnelle, il n'a pas eu à traiter de personnes ayant subi ce bruit d'impact.

Les considérations et les observations donc, nous sont venues d'autres témoins. Le personnel médical de La Romaine, cependant, a révélé que depuis deux (2) ans, il y a eu des comportements chez les enfants en particulier, des comportements particulièrement intrigants pour les professionnels de la santé, c'est-à-dire que les enfants étaient... subissaient des cauchemars répétés et subissaient des formes d'angoisse difficilement idêntifiables.

La première explication donnée avait été comme partout, de penser que c'était lié à des scènes violentes à la télévision; une analyse plus serrée de la question a révélé qu'il n'en était

Fournier, Sub.

pas le cas et les enfants qui subissaient ces traumatismes et ces troubles de comportement et d'angoisse, avaient été des enfants.. étaient tous des enfants qui avaient été soumis à un moment donné ou à un autre à des vols en basse altitude.

La conclusion est à l'effet que ces difficultés de comportement et ces angoisses étaient liées à des survols.

Donc, pour .. le sommaire des témoignages médicaux, le témoin médical de North West River, comme je vous l'ai dit tout à l'heure, n'a pas reçu de plainte au sujet des survols et n'a pas constaté d'impact direct sur la santé provenant de tels vols. À La Romaine, les témoins médicaux ont mis en corrélation des réactions de stress, de cauchemars, de changements de comportements chez des enfants avec l'exposition aux vols militaires en basse altitude dans la campagne.

Les survols rapportés par les Innut , paraissent être des représentations exactes des événements. Bien que tous les problèmes rapportés comme étant reliés de façon causale à des survols, ne peuvent être vérifiés; la conviction est bien que ces corrélations existent et qu'elles sont hautement nuisibles à la santé des Innut et à leur mode de vie. L'ampleur du stress subi par les Innut provenant des survols rapportés, est du point de vue médical tout à fait significatif.

Fournier, Sub.

Les réactions de stress ainsi que leurs séquelles, paraissent avoir une éthiologie multifactorielle.

Les autres témoignages dont on pourra parler en réponse à vos questions, si vous le souhaitez, décrivaient des situations de survols directs subis soit par des chasseurs lorsqu'ils étaient éloignés de leur campement, soit par des familles qui.. dont la tente ou le campement avait été survolé. Et la description faite par ces personnes correspond très directement à ce que l'on peut décrire comme la réaction de stress et de choc suite à un bruit d'impact. Il y a plusieurs témoiganges à cet effet.

Pour ce qui est des incidences sur le mode de vie et sur la culture Innu, je vous résume les observations générales que nous avons établies. De tous les témoignages Innu tout d'abord, est ressorti avec une très grande force, le lien essentiel qu'ils établissent entre leur existence et leur terre. Aucune personne interrogée n'envisage comme possibilité de quitter cette terre et leur communauté pour améliorer leur condition de vie malgré la situation de pauvreté endémique, indiquant que ceci équivaudrait à une forme de suicide. C'est le cas pour les anciens et pour les jeunes interrogés. Et j'ajouterais, c'est pour le cas aussi.. c'est le cas aussi des personnes qui ne se sentent

Fournier, Sub.

pas particulièrement impliquées dans le débat sur la question. Personne n'envisage comme possibilité celle de quitter leur communauté et leur terre.

Dans ce contexte, la fréquentation des campements, intrinsèquement liée au mode de vie traditionnel, est vécue et perçue comme vitale. Bien que tous et toutes ne fréquentent pas régulièrement les campements, toutes les personnes qui se sont exprimées sur cette question, ont affirmé qu'il était essentiel que cette possibilité demeure, afin de permettre le maintien d'une identité ethnique indépendante.

Les représentants de la Montagnais Naskapi Innu Association, ont précisé que la fréquentation des campements produit un sentiment d'appartenance aux groupes et de bonne santé physique et mentale. L'effet des vols en basse altitude sur le mode de vie Innu peut se mesurer à deux (2) points de vue; premièrement, par leur effet sur les personnes et deuxièmement, sur l'écologie.

Sur les personnes, en plus des conséquences affectant l'intégrité physique et mentale des individus soumis aux vols en basse altitude, la mission a constaté des conséquences sur le mode de vie traditionnel lié à ces vols. Ainsi, plusieurs témoins ont expliqué qu'avant ces vols, il était habituel pour les pères et les garçons aînés

Fournier, Sub.

ou pour les adultes masculins de quitter le campement pour plusieurs jours à la fois, afin de poursuivre les activités de chasse ou de pêche et que depuis les vols, ils craignent de laisser seuls les femmes et les enfants pour plus d'une journée. Ils restent en communication avec eux par radio et craignent de laisser leur famille, étant donné que dans le passé récent, il y a eu plusieurs incidents de familles qui ont été terrorisées par des vols en basse altitude.

Certains témoignages ont fait état d'un sentiment de harcèlement, le même avion repassant à plusieurs reprises au dessus d'eux. Plusieurs témoins ont souligné le très grand danger d'être survolés lorsqu'ils sont en canot. Le réflexe de peur et de surprise qui est incontrôlable, faisant perdre la maîtrise du canot. Et il faut préciser que les Innu ne savent pas nager. Ça devient donc une question de vie ou de mort si on perd le contrôle du canot.

Plusieurs témoins ont affirmé préférer maintenant, faire de très longs détours sur terre, plutôt que de traverser les surfaces d'eau même petites de peur d'être survoler. Toutes les personnes survolées ont qualifié l'expérience d'intolérable. Deux (2) chasseurs non Innu de la région de La Romaine, ont témoigné à l'effet qu'à l'été et à l'automne dernier, ils étaient survolés souvent

Fournier, Sub.

plusieurs fois par jour, à ce qu'ils estimaient êtres des altitudes de trente (30) à cinquante (50) pieds et que ces expériences entraînaient une réaction de très grande peur.

Un père Oblat qui a une expérience importante de fréquentation des campements dans la région de Sheshatshit, a témoigné d'un incident où lui-même et ses compagnons ont été survolés par un F-4. Ils ont vu l'appareil apparaître à un (1) mille de distance. En quelques secondes, l'avion était comme sur eux et leur a paru si bas, qu'ils se sont jetés par terre pour l'éviter. Ils en ont éprouvé une très grande frayeur.

Ce témoin estime que de tels survols en basse altitude, même lorsqu'ils ne se produisent pas sur une base quotidienne, sont de nature telle que les êtres humains ne peuvent les tolérer. Ils lui paraissent particulièrement agressants dans la solitude et le calme de la campagne et indiscutablement destructeurs du mode de vie Innu.

En bref, les quelques personnes non Innut qui ont été survolées, ont témoigné que ces expériences étaient traumatisantes. Ces personnes ont affirmé ne pouvoir envisager de vivre pour quelque temps que ce soit dans de telles conditions.

Certains témoins résidants de Sheshatshit et de La Romaine, ont expliqué que la crainte d'avoir à supporter les vols en basse

- Fournier, Sub.

altitude, avait fait écourter le séjour ou empêcher des familles d'aller dans le bois. L'année dernière, presque toutes les familles de La Romaine sont revenues plus tôt à cause des vols. Ils perçoivent ceci comme une atteinte directe à leur liberté de vivre selon leur culture.

Il ressort de l'ensemble des témoignages recueillis que les vols en basse altitude au dessus des territoires traditionnels de chasse et de pêches des Innut provoquent des réactions de terreur chez les personnes qui sont survolées et de crainte pour le bien-être des familles et pour la sécurité des personnes qui ont pour conséquence d'altérer et de rendre très difficile les activités propres au mode de vie Innu.

Enfin, plusieurs témoins ont souligné que l'extension des périodes de vols, vols de nuit et en toute température ainsi que l'augmentation des vols, rendraient les séjours dans le bois extrêmement pénible et que les familles pourraient difficilement les tolérer.

Sur l'écologie, maintenant, quelques mots rapides. Les plaintes concernant les conséquences écologiques des vols sont de deux (2) ordres Premièrement, la pollution de l'environnement provenant des émanations de gaz d'échappement et les effets des bruits sur la faune, en particulier, les

Fournier, Sub.

bruits d'impact provoqués par les vols. Pour ce qui est de la pollution par les gaz, nous avons évoqué que des vols intensifs en basse altitude, déverseraient des tonnes de gaz, lesquels étant émis à une altitude trop basse pour être diffusés dans l'atmosphère se déposeraient directement sur les lacs, les rivières et la végétation. Les témoignages recueillis évoquent des craintes, en particulier concernant la pollution des eaux.

En décrivant les émanations et la nappe graisseuse qui résultent du passage des avions, certains affirment que la mort des poissons trouvés flottants sur les lacs, après les vols, ne peut être liée qu'à l'empoisonnement des eaux. Des poissons morts dans ces conditions n'ont été observés que depuis les cinq (5) dernières années.

Les témoins Innut qui se sont exprimés sur cet aspect de la question, sont unanimes à croire que les émissions qui brûlent les yeux des personnes survolées et qui, selon eux, enpoisonnent l'eau, constituent un danger majeur pour l'écosystème.

Les anciens en particulier, disent craindre que les arbres ne meurent et les femmes qui fabriquent des médicaments, estiment que les émissions de gaz tueront les plantes médicinales. Or, la santé de l'environnement est évidemment essentielle à la pratique du mode de vie.

Fournier, Sub.

Quant à l'effet du bruit sur la faune, de nombreuses plaintes ont été recueillies à Sheshatshit et à La Romaine relatives aux modifications des lieux de pâturage ou de migration des caribous et du comportement des animaux,dont les conséquences sur les chasses traditionnelles seraient très gênantes pour les Innut.

Les conséquences écologiques des survols intensifs sont très controversées et sont l'objet d'étude. La mission est dans l'impossibilité d'avoir la moindre opinion en l'état. Monsieur O'Brien observe qu'il y a une augmentation très forte du troupeau dans le nord de la zone. Le commandant David a indiqué être tenu informé des migrations, des dispositions étant prises pour éviter leurs survols pendant certaines périodes critiques pour les animaux.

Il est difficile de donner le moindre avis sur les plaintes relatives aux conséquences des survols sur les résultats de chasse et de pêche traditionnelle. Pour leur part, cependant, les témoins Innut affirment qu'il était facile auparavant de chasser le caribou sur leur territoire. Les chasseurs sont fermement persuadés que les changements de comportement du troupeau sont causés par les vols. Il est à noter, comme vous le savez, que le caribou est pour le peuple Innu, un élément essentiel de leur mode de vie.

Fournier, Sub.

De nombreuses constatations de modification dans le comportement de petits animaux nous ont été rapportées. Ainsi on évoque que les perdrix sont aujourd'hui maigres et chétives; que les lapins sont retrouvés morts sans cause apparentes; que le castor, qui auparavant était visible le jour, ne sort maintenant que tardivement, qu'il est moins bien nourri et est plus difficile à trapper. Que les oeufs de canard sont souvent détruits et que parfois les parents, canards, ne reviennent pas au nid après le vol. On précise que les belettes et les visons sont beaucoup plus nombreux en dehors de la zone d'entraînement.

Enfin, les témoins ont manifesté une grande inquiétude pour le bien-être des animaux qui doivent demeurer dans les zones d'entraînement et subir les vols en basse altitude.

En bref, les chasseurs expérimentés sont unanimes à établir un lien entre les vols en basse altitude et les problèmes nouveaux qu'ils constatent chez les animaux et les poissons.

Notre conclusion donc, à nous, du point de vue scientifique si vous voulez est difficile à faire, nous ne pouvons pas avoir de conclusions fermes mais nous croyons qu'il y a lieu de pousser une étude sur la question.

Je n'élaborerai pas sur la question d'incidences sur les droits aborigingaux du peuple

Fournier, Sub.

Innu qui n'est pas directement, qui ne touche pas directement votre Commission. Mais je reprendrai pour terminer les conclusions générales de notre observation.

Les conclusions donc de la mission sont les suivantes:

> "Les passages fréquents d'avions à réaction volant à très basse altitude, constituent des atteintes aux droits fondamentaux, à fortiori lorsqu'ils ont un caractère répété, des personnes qui sont victimes des survols. Outre les conséquences traumatiques relevées principalement chez les enfants, les vols en rase-mottes ont créé un sentiment de harcèlement, de pression permanente chez les Innut et un état de fragilisation psychologique à tout ce qui touche leur statut en tant que personne Innu et en tant que population autochtone.
>
> La mission conclut en ce que les activités actuelles d'entraînement militaire, constituent une atteinte, non seulement aux droits fondamentaux des

Fournier, Sub.

individus par les altérations qu'elles provoquent à leur intégrité physique et mentale mais au droit collectif du peuple Innu en ce qu'elles rendent très pénibles les activités traditionnelles intrinsèquement liées à l'existence et à la vitalité de la collectivité du peuple Innu. En ce qui concerne l'état des négociations avec les autorités fédérales, il semble qu'elles soient présentement dans l'impasse; dès lors que le gouvernement fédéral avait reconnu,ainsi qu'indiqué plus haut, l'existence des droits territoriaux des nations .. des premières nations et que dans le passé, cette reconnaissance a été concrétisée par des traités ou des ententes dans d'autres parties du Québec et du Canada, cet état de fait, tant qu'il ne sera pas réglé par un accord entre les parties, constituera une violation des

Fournier, Sub.

droits fondamentaux des populations autochtones Innu".

Merci, Monsieur le Président.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I suspect that that presentation may generate a few questions and comments. First hand up right there. Would you like to come forward, please? I would ask each person to state his or her name for the record, even though you may have spoken already earlier today.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: I am Claris Rudkowski, and I think maybe the first question may be directed to you, Mr. Chairman. I did come in a little late so I am not quite sure on the group, but from the presentation I assume it is the International Federation of Human Rights; is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: Bishop Leguerrier was on that commission and I do not know if he was in Happy Valley-Goose Bay,but the question I have to you: Bishop Leguerrier, being on that Commission, came in to investigate a complaint by the Innu people and then in September I understand, Mr. Chairman, he made a presentation to your Panel on behalf of the Innu; is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is correct.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: I must point out to you that another member of this Panel was Doctor Bargan and I will further point out to you that Doctor Bargan is a member of the Sierra Club, which is an environmental group in the United States, and the Sierra Club was invited to an Innu assembly in

Sheshatshit in May, 1985. Having said that, I would like to point out to you those instances may call into question the impartiality of that Panel.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you would excuse me just for a moment to clarify the record, it has been pointed out to me that when the Bishop spoke to us in September it was our understanding that he was doing so on a personal nature and not as representative of the federation or of any other body.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: But, I believe the focus for his presentation was for the Innu concerns.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: So, what I am going to suggest to you further then, is that what we heard here today is simply a rehash of everything that we see within the peace activist groups' publications and everything else. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comment. Would somebody else like to speak?

MR. IAN STRACHEN: My name is Ian Strachen and I am with the Mokami Project Group. I am also President of the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce. Just for a little clarification on that, I am involved in the woods industry and our monies and revenues very seldom come from any association with the military, but you made a statement in which you stated that the economy, or the economic people in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay, businessmen and so on, were diametrically opposed to the Innu land claims, against an understanding of what the Innu wanted and it was getting close to a situation where there was a good deal of strife on these issues, and, in fact, if I correctly got it, that it was coming to the point of violence.

MS. FOURNIER: Finish your question, but I think there is a clarification to --

MR. STRATCHEN: My total point is this: We have for a long, long time lived close to both the Innu and the Inuit, and my particular background where I worked with the Inuit in the preparation of their land claims long before I came to Goose Bay.

Our position is very clear on this, as a group of businessmen and as a Chamber of Commerce. We have stated to the Panel before on occasions and we have stated clearly for a long time now, that the land claim situation and the land claim negotiating positions of both the provincial and the federal governments are not supported by us; their position of negating or almost not encouraging the Innu on their land claim settlement is somewhat despicable.

We support the Innu in their land claims settlements; not only supporting it in order to get it out of the way, but we are supporting it on the basis that whatever they see as land claim that they wish to make, whether it is self-government or whatever type of forum it is, and whether it takes the next 10 years or 20 years to settle, the fact is that it must be started and it must get into a position to determination.

The points in which there is a conflict there, there is absolutely no conflict on that issue whatsoever among any of the businessmen, and speaking to them as an elected representative, I strongly take exception to any discussion that we are opposed. We have stated to the Panel on an occasion before, that although land claims is outside of their ability to look at according to their recommendations, we still believe, fundamentally, that low flying military aircraft are not the issue in this case.

We believe that within the Innu and the Inuit there is a serious situation regarding land claim settlement and whether it was aluminium smelters, pulp and paper mills, or low level flying, they have a just cause based on land claims rather than the specific development we are talking about.

We also agree with them that on the development of the Churchill Falls, a hydroelectric system, which did not at that time historically allow an input such as this by the Innu, then I think that was definitely historically wrong, but I want to make quite sure that we are not insensitive. We are, in fact, very, very sensitive.

MS. FOURNIER: I will respond to this because I am glad you have made the precision if there was an ambiguity, but that is not our position. We did not say and I do not think I have said in French, that the Chamber of Commerce or the white community or the business community of Happy Valley is against the question of recognizing the land claims of the Innu. That is not what I said.

What we did say, though, that was very visible, was a situation of tension between the two communities right now, that we think is worse than probably what governments seem to recognize, and this tension is linked to a series of reasons, and it has to be looked into very seriously before it explodes. That is what I am saying. But, we did not say that the business community was against the --

MR. STRACHEN: I understand the gist of what you are saying there. Let me say, quite clearly, on the whole tension and violence, there are differences of opinion among us and some of the Innu, who are friends of ours and friends of mine. I have no difficulty accepting the fact that we have differences of opinion exactly the same as differences of opinion within Happy Valley-Goose Bay on many, many issues.

In fact, we are working with them on some economic developments together, on other issues in which we are together on these issues, and I do not think that a debate on low level flying is getting, as far as we have perceived, into a situation of violence. There is, obviously, a healthy difference of opinion and we welcome that, and, in fact, that is everybody's right to do so and the hearings, in fact, are encouraging some of this position. But, I still think we are not at great loggerheads on many, many other issues, and certainly we are not to the point of being in a violent situation against many of them who are our friends and who we were with half an hour ago and will be meeting in the next few days to talk about an economic development that we are trying to work together.

So, I have difficulty on that issue. There was one further point, on a personal note: I live a quarter of a mile from the end of the runway in Goose Bay, Labrador. I have a wife and three children. My three children were born in Labrador. Every aircraft which leaves Goose Bay, if I do not get it leaving I certainly get it landing, passes my home. My children are impervious to aircraft. I am old-fashioned enough to think that aircraft are pretty and so I watch aircraft and my children just do not watch them at all. They are not the slight bit interested in them.

But, your question about oil film and water from low flying jets and aircraft -- as I say, we get every aircraft; I also set snares or slips, as we call them, down in the marsh below my house where we slip rabbits, and I have never seen or yet seen a film on the water from any jets. I have seen pollution from tankers, which I think is a wrong situation in Goose Bay at the moment. I have seen lots of that but I have never witnessed -- and, as I say, I am not talking about occasional overflight or every second day overflight; I am talking about every aircraft which lands in Goose Bay and takes off from Goose Bay passing by the area that I live, and I take issue with that part of the argument, because you are trying to state quite clearly that this has had a serious, serious effect. I have never seen it.

MS. FOURNIER: I would suggest that there should be a very close study made of these different allegations, but your expertise, your daily expertise is worth it and it should be looked into, but there are others also who say something different, so it has to be looked into and the animals.

MR. STRACHEN: I also talk for the Mokami Project group and the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce. As the Mokami Project group, we do not walk hand in hand with the military touting or presenting a military line. I can assure you of that. We also have our differences with the military. We may have differences in some environmental aspects. We may have differences in some caribou migration aspects. We may have differences on the economic benefit to young people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and we are tackling that.

So, I wanted to present that very clearly, that we, as a group, may have difficulties in some areas. Lots of other areas we have no difficulties, but as the Mokami Project group we absolutely agree with you on one issue definitely, that there should studies. In fact, we have called for studies on many areas, and I think that these should be studies -- for instance, there has never ever been a socio-economic study in Goose Bay to give the benefits of the military base in Goose Bay, partly because it is drawn up together and one has never been examined from that point of view.

But, we still do not believe that it means the end of Goose Bay which all military flying would mean. Eight thousand people would die tomorrow economically and be put on welfare or unemployed or whatever else it caused. We believe the studies should be implemented and put in place, to carry on, and we have no argument with that whatsoever.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Next speaker, please?

MR. HICKEY: John Hickey from Happy Valley-Goose Bay, member of the Mokami Project group. I just wanted to address a couple of things which you said there in regards to the skinny partridge and lack of fur and there are no rabbits, from what you are saying. Is that correct, or what did you say about the rabbits?

MS. FOURNIER: What I have reported is, there are witnesses who have told us that they have found dead rabbits on the road in different places where there had been flights, and that they had never seen this before the flights began.

MR. HICKEY: I suggest to you that the reason why the rabbits are dead on the road is because they have been run over by the vehicles, because there are that many of them this year. We have had an exceptional year in Labrador for rabbits, the most we have seen since I ever lived there most of my life since I was six years old.

In regard to partridges, I can assure you as a hunter, and I hunt every weekend pretty well and I also trap, that this is the best year we have seen in Labrador for fur. Martins are numerous this year and the partridges are not skinny. They are very fat, as a matter of fact.

MS. FOURNIER: That very well may be. What I think should be held in consideration is where it is you are hunting. I am talking about the areas where there is military low flights.

MR. HICKEY: At the end of runway 37, about a quarter of a mile from there I have 15 rabbit snares and I am after catching 15 rabbits, so I suggest to you that the rabbit population around the airport is very good.

Just another point I would like to make is that you talked about the shock and seizure of animals because of the jet flying. Just as a point of interest, in case you did not know it, just last year we had a fellow bring 10 horses into Happy Valley-Goose Bay and begin a business. That business is at the end of the runway and those horses are breeding, people are riding them around the airport and he has no problem with his business.

MS. FOURNIER: That is very interesting to add to a study but from a scientific point of view you have to look at every possibility. That is one thing. I suppose one would want to look into other witness' aspects, what other witnesses have to bring and their own experiences, which seem to be different.

This, again, points out to the necessity, I think, to have a very serious study.

MR. HICKEY: I fully agree with you, that we need these studies done, but what I am saying to you is that some of the information that you gave here today as to backing up an argument why studies should be done; I think we agree that studies need to be done, but the fact is we have skinny partridge in Labrador is not a good reason, in my opinion, to have a study done on the partridge. We see the numbers and the numbers are there and the hunters who hunt them certainly would be looking forward to that if the numbers were deteriorating, but that is not the case.

MS. FOURNIER: It may depend where they are hunted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions or comments pertaining to this last presentation? If not, then I would thank the speakers very much on behalf of the Panel.

Now, as I said at the beginning of this afternoon's session, this has been the only scheduled presentation for this afternoon. Could I ask a member of the Secretariat whether anybody has approached them since lunch hour to register? No. Well, in that case, I throw open an invitation, as I did in the latter part of this morning to any individual or representative from any group that has not previously made a presentation to this Panel in this series of meetings to come forward this afternoon and speak to the Panel. You are welcome to speak in either English or French. It is your preference.

Would anyone have a question that they would care to put to the Panel concerning the review or to the Department of National Defence concerning the nature of the Project? Yes, please, come forward. Please give your name for the record.

JOSÉE MAILHOT: Oui, mon nom est Josée Mailhot. On me demande de transmettre une demande à la Commission ici. Des gens viennent d'arriver de Sheshatshit et ils ont... ils sont en possession d'un vidéo, apparemment, qu'ils souhaiteraient montrer ici, dans ce cadre-ci. Ils n'ont malheureusement pas les appareils techniques. Est-ce que la Commission pourrait s'arranger pour mettre à leur disposition les équipements techniques nécessaires à montrer ce vidéo, à la condition, bien sûr, que la Commission soit d'accord pour qu'on leur donne la chance de montrer ce document visuel.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I would like to call a brief adjournment in the meeting so I could speak directly to the persons who would like to show the video and we will make a decision. Does that sound reasonable? Let us adjourn for five minutes or so.

---Brief adjournment.

---Upon resuming:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, the group seems about as large now as it is going to get. We had a request just before our break for the presentation at this session of a video tape. We are withholding a decision on that momentarily pending clarification of the identification of the party or parties who would be presenting that video tape. In any case, it would not be shown here this afternoon at this session because the equipment is not readily available. If the Panel is satisfied on that matter later this afternoon, there is a possibility that that presentation might be made at tonight's session.

In the meantime if there is no one else at the present time who wishes to say anything, then I would be inclined to adjourn this session. So, there is one more chance before I do so. If not, then I declare this session adjourned and we will reconvene in this room at 7:00 o'clock tonight. Thank you very much.

---Dinner adjournment.

---Upon resuming at 7:00 P.M.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening ladies and gentlemen and thank you for coming to the meeting. For those of you who were not here this morning, my name is David Barnes and I am the Chairman of this Environmental Assessment Panel, which, at the request of the Minister of the Environment, is conducting a public environmental review into certain existing and proposed military flying activities to be based at Goose Bay, Labrador.

We had a fairly lengthy presentation this morning outlining the review process, and describing the Project that is under review. We would not intend to repeat that at this time. I will explain, briefly, that in order to carry out this review the Panel will be requesting the Department of National Defence, which is the proponent in this case, to prepare and submit to the Panel a document called an Environmental Impact Statement.

In order to ensure that that document covers all of the appropriate material in the best way and most useful way possible, the Panel will be presenting to National Defence sometime in December a set of instructions for the purpose, which will be called "Guidelines for the Preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement".

The purpose of this round of meetings, which ends tonight with this session, is mainly to solicit and listen to comments on a draft version of that Guidelines document, which was published by the Panel in August of this year.

I believe it has become obvious to anyone who has been following the progress of our meetings that we have, in fact, received a great deal of other sorts of information in addition to direct comments on particular sections of the draft Guidelines. We have chosen to permit that in the interest of obtaining as much information as possible, which the Panel might be able to use in its task of improving on the draft to produce the final version of the Guidelines. We felt that in most cases there was sufficient time available in our sessions to permit other sorts of presentations, and given that this is the preliminary stage of the review and these meetings were intended to be relatively informal, that we could hardly go wrong in deciding to follow that course.

As I indicated this afternoon, after we have heard from the scheduled speakers for tonight, the Panel will be quite happy to hear any questions which anyone may have to ask about the review process, and representatives of the Department of National Defence are with us and are quite prepared to respond to questions about the Project itself.

To continue on then in hearing the presentations from intervenors, the first speaker for this evening is to be Mrs. Lilianne Cotnoir, and if she is ready I would ask her to go ahead.

LILIANNE COTNOIR: Okay, j'ai appris tout à l'heure que j'étais la seule intervenante ce soir. Ce n'est pas que je voulais vous faire venir tous, seulement pour moi. J'ai même essayé de venir cet après midi, j'étais ici à quatre heures et demie (4:30 h.), non pas que je croyais vous éviter de venir ce soir mais c'est surtout parce que je croyais.. j'espérais du moins passer dans l'après midi. Alors, comme il n'y avait personne bien, je me suis pointée seulement à sept heures (7:00 h.), on est obligé de vivre avec.

Maintenant, je vais passer à la présentation, je représente le groupe de Recherches en Écologie Sociale et Humaine; notre bureau est présentement à l'Université de Montréal.

Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Secrétaire exécutif de la Commission, Messieurs et Madame, membres de la Commission mais comme je vois, la chaise de la seule femme de la Commission est vide. Je ne sais pas ce qui est arrivé mais en tout cas, quand il y a une seule femme, ça augmente les risques qu'on se ramasse avec seulement des hommes. Je ne dis pas qu'ils ne font pas nécessairement du bon travail mais je pense que le point de vue des femmes peut quand même être d'un apport intéressant ou peut apporter des solutions différentes. Je suis un peu déçue à ce niveau-là. Mais passons quand

Cotnoir, Sub.

même à mon mémo, il sera court mais je crois que ce sont des précisions qui peuvent être importantes, à mon avis.

Okay, les vols militaires en territoires terre-neuviens et québécois auront des conséquences importantes pour les deux (2) provinces en question mais aussi pour tout le Canada. Est-ce que vous m'entendez bien, est-ce que je parle suffisamment fort ? Oui, okay.

Le projet de mise en place d'un centre intégré d'entraînement à l'emploi des armes de chasseurs tactiques pour les forces aériennes de l'OTAN est un programme militaire qui doit être jugé par la population. L'importance des impacts sur les milieux sociaux et le milieu bio-physique de même que l'importance de cette nouvelle orientation militaire, nécessite qu'un débat public soit lancé. S'il n'est pas lancé, de toute façon, comme c'est un débat national, on va devoir le subir en audience parce que les gens vont vouloir s'exprimer sur ce point de vue là. Mais s'il n'y a pas de place pour ce débat-là, ça va sûrement - si ce n'est pas déjà commencé - poser des problèmes au niveau de l'organisation ou poser des ambiguïtés sur les procédures. C'est pourquoi j'ai jugé important qu'il faut toujours, pour un projet d'envergure nationale, aussi inclure la possibilité de débattre sur la question des enjeux.

Cotnoir, Sub.

Le Bureau fédéral d'Évaluation Environnementale a entrepris des consultations; présentement, la Commission termine la série de réunions publiques concernant le projet de directive pour la préparation de l'énoncé des incidences environnementales.

La consultation publique peut être un bon outil pour améliorer la qualité de l'évaluation environnementale. À cet effet, il est nécessaire que soit étudiée la justification du projet par le public et ce pour les raisons énoncées par le Bureau Fédéral des Évaluations Environnementales dans l'ébauche des directives en page dix-sept (17). Je suis d'accord avec ces raisons et même, il y en a quelques-unes qu'on pourrait ajouter aussi.

De même, il faut évaluer les impacts sociaux et bio-physiques susceptibles d'être créés par le projet. Si le promoteur doit consulter la population, tel que l'exige la présente ébauche des directives en page dix (10), il faut que le promoteur soumette les modalités selon lesquelles il consultera la population. Alors, ça, c'est pour préciser peut-être une des directives qui avaient été données par le Bureau.

La Commission doit pouvoir porter un jugement sur le processus de consultation du promoteur et aussi rendre ces procédures utilisées par le promoteur, il doit les rendre public. Il faut

Cotnoir, Sub.

identifier clairement les questions pour lesquelles il subsiste des incertitudes. Je le précise même si le Bureau Fédéral a pris soin de le faire, si je le précise, c'est parce que souvent, même si précisé dans les directives, le promoteur a tendance à escamoter un peu ce problème-là. Alors, c'est pour ça que je mets encore l'accent sur cette question.

Il faut penser les moyens qui limiteront les impacts si le projet doit être réalisé. Il faut aussi établir des mécanismes de suivi et de contrôle afin d'assurer que les conditions d'insertion soit respectées. Non seulement il faut se fier sur la bonne ... non seulement il faut se fier sur le promoteur mais il faut avoir des mécanismes prévus, qui soient connus du public pour assurer un suivi et un contrôle du...de la réalisation du projet.

De même,une commission d'enquête indépendante du promoteur doit pouvoir évaluer les impacts réels encourus après la réalisation du projet. Alors, il faut vraiment aussi, à ce niveau-là, pas seulement se fier sur le promoteur, parce finalement on.. la plupart du temps, on ne sait pas exactement quelles sont les études mais il faut aller plus loin. Il faut qu'une Commission d'enquête soit vraiment établie pour pouvoir avoir un suivi à ce niveau-là.

Cotnoir, Sub.

De plus, des mesures de correction devront être imposées si elles s'avèrent nécessaires. Nous insistons particulièrement sur trois (3) aspects souvent oubliés ou négligés.

Alors, je vais répéter trois (3) des principes auxquels je tiens beaucoup, auxquels nous avons accordés beaucoup d'importance. Peut-être parce que justement, ce sont des éléments qui étaient absents dans les directives du Bureau Fédéral de l'Évaluation Environnementale ou de la Commission finalement du Bureau.

Alors, il est nécessaire que soit étudiée la justification du projet par le public. Si le promoteur doit consulter la population telle que l'exige la présente ébauche des directives en page dix (10), il faut que le promoteur soumette les modalités selon lesquelles il consultera la population.

Il est important qu'on connaisse ces procédures parce qu'il y a différentes façons de le faire et des... il faut y aller avec une certaine éthique. Et je crois qu'il est fondamental qu'on puisse juger de cette... de ce processus de consultation. Et aussi, comme le Bureau... comme la Commission est chargée elle aussi de consulter le public, il faut voir dans quelle mesure le promoteur ne fait pas une procédure qui viendrait

Cotnoir, Sub.

peut-être fausser le processus de la Commission.

Enfin, une Commission d'enquête indépendante du promoteur doit pouvoir évaluer les impacts réels encourus après la réalisation du projet. Alors, voilà pour les directives plus spécifiques. Passons à l'autre partie.

Enfin, pour que la consultation ait un sens, il faut informer la population suffisamment à l'avance pour lui permettre de s'organiser et d'étudier le dossier. Les avis doivent être de dimensions assez grandes pour être aperçus des lecteurs dans les journaux.

Le projet de mise en place d'un centre intégré d'entraînement pour les forces aériennes de l'OTAN soulevant des enjeux nationaux, des avis de consultation devraient être envoyés dans tous les journaux du Québec et de Terre-Neuve et au moins dans les principaux journaux des autres provinces.

Le contenu des avis doit permettre de connaître l'objectif de la consultation. De même, il doit indiquer les endroits où l'on peut consulter le dossier. Et j'insiste à ce niveau-là, c'est important que les gens aient à leur disposition un endroit pour consulter le dossier. À Montréal, il faut téléphoner à Québec pour pouvoir avoir le dossier. Si on a appris à la dernière minute qu'il y a une audience, à ce moment-là, on est pris avec

Cotnoir, Sub.

les délais de poste ou encore quand la documentation est devenue trop volumineuse, on ne peut plus la consulter sur place.

Alors, il serait important qu'il y ait un endroit de désigner dans les endroits principaux pour pouvoir consulter cette documentation.

La présente réunion publique laisse sceptique aussi. Pourquoi est-il nécessaire de donner une dernière chance à la population et aux associations désireuses de faire des commentaires. C'est ce que disait finalement, l'avis public.. le seul avis public que j'ai vu dans le Devoir, je ne sais pas si j'étais aveugle pour les autres, c'est ce que disait l'avis, c'était une dernière chance laissée à la population, aux associations de faire des commentaires.

Y aurait-il eu des manques dans l'organisation et la réalisation des réunions précédentes. Cette réunion publique additionnelle fut annoncée publiquement le treize (13) novembre mil neuf cent quatre-vingt-six (1986), certains groupes environnementaux, par exemple, l'AQLPA, l'Association Québécoise pour la Lutte contre les pluies acides, la lutte contre les pluies acides, ont-reçu un avis le mardi onze (11) novembre. Il ne restait donc que six (6) jours à l'Association pour se préparer. Pour sa part, la population n'avait que quatre (4) jours pour le faire. L'intention d'offrir une

Cotnoir, Sub.

dernière chance à la population était bonne, je ne la remets pas en question. Il faut, néanmoins, pour réaliser l'objectif, mettre en place des conditions nécessaires afin que ces groupes puissent agir. Une semaine de délai est loin d'être suffisant pour organiser une intervention qui soit adéquate. Le court laps de temps laissé aux associations et la population - et je parle en particulier pour Montréal - est susceptible de laisser les groupes avec un sentiment amer.

Plutôt que d'arriver à l'amélioration de l'évaluation des projets en sollicitant la participation, un vent d'agressivité est soulevé. Les consultations populaires prennent leur sens lorsque la participation du public peut se faire de façon efficace et cohérente. Plusieurs principes de base simples doivent être suivis. Nous souhaitons que le Bureau Fédéral d'Évaluations Environnementales adapte sa procédures de consultation en fonction des enjeux particuliers que présentent ce projet de mise en place d'un centre intégré d'entraînement des forces aériennes de L'OTAN.

Finalement, j'ai quelques questions mais qui sont plus reliées avec la suite des événements. Je voudrais par exemple, savoir où auront lieu les audiences publiques pour juger de l'étude d'impact. Quelle forme prendront les avis et dans quels journaux ils paraîtront ? Est-ce que les

Cotnoir, Sub.

associations seront prévenues ? Et est-ce qu'il est possible d'avoir la liste de ces associations-là? Est-ce qu'il y aura un bureau à Montréal où il sera possible de consulter le dossier, comprenant le contenu des réunions publiques, le dossier de presse, le contenu des études d'impact, le contenu des séances techniques, le contenu des séances communautaires et le contenu des séances générales ?

Finalement, ce sont des dossiers qu'on ne pourra pas suivre partout au Québec parce qu'on ne peut... finalement, c'est une question d'organisation, le Québec est grand, il faut vivre avec les difficultés des distances finalement. Mais s'il y a un centre à Montréal, il y a beaucoup de gens intéressés qui pourraient avoir accès à ces documents.

En même temps, je voudrais savoir qui sera invité pour les séances communautaires ? Quelle forme prendront ces séances ? Et en même temps aussi, comment la population peut-elle suggérer des experts techniques et comment se dérouleront les différentes séances ?

Bon, on a un peu un résumé dans la documentation qui avait été envoyée. Mais je ne crois pas que ce soit suffisant pour que la population puisse vraiment saisir les enjeux et aussi puisse vraiment mieux agir, alors, pour pouvoir finalement avoir une participation qui soit le plus

Cotnoir, Sub.

efficace possible. Je pense que ce sont des précisions qui doivent être nécessaires si on veut que les groupes puissent fonctionner et puis apporter le meilleur... la meilleur aide possible pour l'évaluation des impacts.

Alors, c'est tout, je vous remercie de votre attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation. I would like to respond to one thing and that is with regard to the notice of this meeting. The main reason for arranging for this meeting, which was not part of the original list of meetings that were scheduled, was to accommodate 12 groups in Montreal who came to be interested in this review, and who complained on October 20th when we held a meeting in Montreal, that they had not had enough time to prepare their comments on the draft Guidelines. Those groups, through their legal counsel, requested that the Panel go back again to Montreal at about the end of November.

We felt that there had been quite adequate notice of that meeting in Montreal, approximately one month ahead, which meant that those groups had had as much notice as anybody else in the review before the date of the meeting and should have had time enough to prepare their comments. We felt that we could not go back to Montreal for another session at the end of November because it would have delayed the whole process too much.

As an alternative then, we announced this meeting because it was possible for us to add this meeting into the schedule, simply because the Panel is going to be here in Hull during this week preparing the final form of these Guidelines, and it was simple enough to arrange to hold this meeting here.

We felt that Hull is not very far away from Montreal. The distance can be driven in about two hours and, therefore, we published a notice on October 30th that this meeting would be held and, in fact, the legal counsel to the 12 groups in Montreal would have been told about this over the telephone before this announcement was published in a number of newspapers. So, I would not agree that there has been inadequate notice of this meeting.

As it has turned out, the 12 groups for whom this meeting was especially arranged, have chosen, for reasons best known to themselves, to boycott this meeting. They have not come, which would lead one to doubt the sincerity of their wishes to make useful comments on the draft Guidelines.

Beyond that, you have a great many other questions. I was able to write down only one or two of those because they were coming at a fair rate, so I will wait until I have seen the transcript of this meeting and the Panel will discuss your questions and we will certainly do our best to provide answers to them. Many of them are matters of procedure.

You may be aware that the Panel has already issued a document of general procedures for the review. Beyond that, it will be our intention, well in advance, to issue a document of procedures for the public hearings in particular, dealing with a great many of the questions that you have raised.

5

I think it is a little too early at this stage to decide where all of those hearings will be held, since we may be approximately a year and a half to two years away from that time, but nevertheless we will do our best to answer your questions as soon as we have looked at the transcript of the meeting, if that will be satisfactory.

LILIANNE COTNOIR: Et puis il serait intéressant que peut-être les groupes environnementaux du Québec, soient finalement informés de ces procédures et pas nécessairement.. pas seulement les procédures d'audiences publiques générales mais aussi toutes les autres, les séances techniques et les séances communautaires, ce sont toutes des séances qui sont intéressantes et dans lesquelles.. à travers lesquelles on peut apprendre finalement à mieux juger le projet. Alors, je crois que les groupes finalement, c'est la meilleure façon de rendre l'intervention des groupes la plus efficace possible. Si.. comme la Commission est là pour ça, finalement, à essayer d'aller chercher l'avis des gens, il faut essayer de prendre les moyens pour la rendre la plus efficace.

Alors, c'est pour... moi, c'est surtout pour ça là que j'ai amené mon intervention; préciser les besoins qu'ont suggérés finalement les groupes de Montréal et finalement, il y avait aussi un groupe de Québec.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Panel would certainly agree with you in that we will do our best to make it as easy as possible for any interested party to participate in this review, because we are certainly interested in hearing any information throughout the course of this process which can be useful to the Panel in carrying out its mandate.

MME. COTNOIR: Est-ce qu'il est trop tôt pour indiquer s'il y aurait un endroit à Montréal où il serait possible de consulter la documentation?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have no plan at the present time to establish an office in Montreal where there would be a copy of the public file, which, I believe, is what you are talking about.

We have only one office of that sort, I believe -- I stand to be corrected; that is, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay at the present time where a complete copy of the public file is located. If one were to think of other locations such as Montreal, as you suggest, we might also have to think about other locations.

I will not make any commitment at the present time, but the Panel will think very carefully about that.

LILIANNE COTNOIR: Okay, je m'excuse, parce que finalement, ça n'entraînerait pas nécessairement des coûts plus élevés. Il y a des bureaux d'Environnement Canada à Montréal, il y a peut-être quelqu'un sur place qui peut prendre la responsabilité. Tout ce qu'il reste à faire, c'est reproduire la documentation.

Si c'est un projet qui est de l'OTAN, si c'est un projet d'envergure finalement.. qui implique finalement plusieurs... une importante somme d'argent, je ne crois pas que la question budget vienne poser des problèmes à ce sujet-là.

Et puis, d'après moi, c'est essentiel pour assurer une meilleure information de la population.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is certainly worth considering. I think the choice of Happy Valley-Goose Bay was logical, given that that is the centre of the proposal. If one were to think of other locations, either in Newfoundland/Labrador, or in Quebec, one would have to think about which centres would be more convenient for the parties who stand to be most affected in one way or another by this Project, if it should proceed. So, one might have to wonder whether within Quebec Montreal would be the best place or some other place like Kuujjuaq or Schefferville, for example. So, we promise to think very carefully about that and thank you for your suggestion. Thank you very much.

This afternoon I was allowing questions and comments on each presentation. Given that we have only one other presentation scheduled for this evening, if you are willing, Mrs. Cotnoir, perhaps I could ask if anybody would care to make a comment or ask a question of clarification to you. No, I see not. Well, thank you anyway.

As our second scheduled intervention for this evening, we have a presentation to be made by Father Len Paradis on behalf of the Project North Group. Father Paradis, perhaps you would like to explain a little bit about what the presentation would consist of.

---SUBMISSION BY FATHER LEN PARADIS:

Just one clarification first, that I

Paradis, sub.

chose not to represent Project North, but that I chose to represent the Oblates. The Oblates have had a major commitment among the native people since they first arrived in Canada in 1841, and this is the group I would like to represent for this presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the clarification.

FATHER PARADIS: The first part would be a video, a 31-minute video, and then I will make a short presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine. Please go ahead whenever you are ready. I might suggest that those seated at the back might like to move over toward the front and that side of the room, to your left, to get a better view of the TV screen.

(Following is a summary of video presentation presented at hearing with commentator's comments and some identified speakers):

Military exercises have been in Labrador since 1979. Canadian, German and British planes have been seen in manoeuvres so low that native people claim the canvas of their tents is rippled by the jets' slipstream. Labrador native people oppose low level flying on several grounds. They say it is harmful to both wildlife and humans, and they want proper environmental studies done.

Meanwhile the provincial government

Paradis, sub.

is encouraging military expansion in Labrador, saying there is no evidence that low level flying is harmful. "We want to get our message across to the Canadian public and to the world, that we do not like what is happening here: The militarization of our territory."

Sunday morning in Sheshatshit, Labrador, a tiny village of 600 Innu people; sister village to Innu communities found on the north shore of Quebec and Davis Inlet in northern Labrador. Sheshatshit is now a community of skidoos, radios; colour TVs and many modern conveniences that are very new to the new society. People settled here in houses roughly 25 years ago and prior to that they came here only in the summertime.

It is hard to believe that many of the Innus here just gave up their nomadic hunting ways in the 1950s. They gave them up reluctantly. Industrial developments like Churchill Falls and the Labrador linerboard mill forced them into our technological society.

The Roman Catholic Church, government wildlife regulations and schools for their children, have eroded the Innu's travelling ways, their treasured country life. It has eroded their self esteem and taken away their traditional way of life.

But enough of the old values and old ways still remain and the Innu want to build

Paradis, sub.

a new society on this. Sheshatshit and the Innu people have reached a critical point in their history. They are in real danger of being assimulated by the rest of North American society. The Innus want to prevent this before it is too late.

The Innu have to decide how much of the new they will accept and how badly this will erode their tradition, and bring them more and more into mainstream North American life with its values.

The old ways and values are worth keeping. Michel Pastine is teaching them to his grandson, David Hart. There is a wonderful tradition of Innu society of sharing grandchildren with their grandparents. A sort of informal adoption takes place where the grandchild chosen will be raised by the grandparents. This provides the old people with companionship and the joy of continuous contact with the young. It is also an important way of passing on the old values.

This is what young David Hart will learn, whether it is making snowshoes for living in the country. ...

But, whether he prefers the country or not David will continue going to school. His parents want this for him as well, but they want a mix of both worlds so that David can choose between them when he is older.

David's grandmother, Mary Pastine, still dresses the way Innu women did many years ago,

Paradis, sub.

and the way many Innu women still dress in northern Quebec, but it is a style of dress that has been disappearing in Sheshatshit unless it is worn on one of these popular tea dolls that are made here. Ansla Andrews did not want that style of dress to disappear totally from the village, so she has been making dolls dressed like this for many years.

The dolls are made with intricate detail from the tiny caribou skin moccasins to the beaded hairband. Many other goods are made by hand such as moccasins and gloves made of caribou skin. They are not mass produced and they are primarily made for family members and friends.

Our cash economy is somewhat new to the Innu. Young people in Sheshatshit are caught between the two cultures. They are bright, better educated in our world than their parents, for whom it is all still very new. They like the same music and sports all young people like, but they know they are different; their background is different.

And, they are caught between the desire to be like everyone else and to be loyal at the same time to their parents and their people. Many of them are searching for a way to combine the two. It is not easy. The greatest skill of these northern people is their ability to survive on the Labrador barrens in sub-Arctic conditions. This has

Paradis, sub.

made them a strong and independent people. Families still go into the country each year to hunt for food and animal fur.

It is a different life than that in the village. Some people say it is a much healthier life for Innu families. Here people are self sufficient and healthy. There is lots to keep you busy in the country. No time to brood on the idleness of the village. There are no jobs in the village. Government welfare cheques and baby bonuses are a poor substitute for this way of life.

But, ironically, government policies make this way of life difficult to pursue. There is no hunting near the village. Families must go much further away now and for that they have to hire planes, something they cannot often afford.

There is the tug to give their children an education in the white man's world and that also ties into the village. Now, two philosophies are growing up in the community about where to go next. One route favours economic development with white people. Indian guides for white sports hunters and royalties for industrial activity on Innu land.

The other favours the Innu running their own economic and social development, making decisions for themselves. Phyllis Paulin says she did not choose to live in Sheshatshit. She was brought

Paradis, sub.

there from the Labrador bush in the 1960s, told by the Newfoundland government that her children had to go to school, and if she came here the government would build her a house with running water and with modern conveniences. She got her house but it is small and poorly constructed. There are no modern conveniences, nor is there running water, and it is a long walk for water in the winter.

There is no work in Sheshatshit. The people depend totally on welfare. The suicide rate here is five times the national average. Twice as high as in other native communities in Canada. Baby deaths are common. "I have started consultations to formulate a new counselling program for northern Labrador beginning with these assemblies. This counselling plan will assist the native people with home economics and all native skills. I may also add at this time that a development worker will soon be in place in the community of Davis Inlet for our department. Armed with these skills, the native peoples will be better able to care for their families and their houses, making a much better life and a brighter, healthier future for themselves."

This is an example: A government-run cooking and housekeeping course. In other parts of the province, the course is for the mentally handicapped. In Sheshatshit, it is for Indian women. The women learn to cook with utensils they do not

Paradis, sub.

have and learn the importance of eating fresh vegetables, even though vegetables are scarce here, and they learn how to clean bathrooms even though they do not have bathrooms. The government says these are valuable life skills.

Delila MacEachran recently lost her job here as a social worker. She was fired because she disagrees with government policy. "What it does, to me, is give the message to Innu people that the way they live, the values they hold, are wrong and they should not have those. If they want to be good people, then they have to adopt this other way of doing things."

Some try to reject the other way of doing things by returning to the land their ancestors lived off for hundreds of years. Here they seem happy. Still, life in the bush is no longer what it used to be. No longer can these people hunt the land freely, not with government game laws. The old ways and the new ways constantly clash.

In Sheshatshit this teenage girl wears the standard Michael Jackson T-shirt but she does her homework in a tent, because her family does not feel comfortable in the house. "The Innu people have a lot of psychological strain. You know, with 20-30 years span they have had to change to another culture, and you still have people, a large percentage of the people, have not adapted to that kind of life."

Paradis, sub.

Peter Panatchewa is 20 years old and he is angry. "Of course I am angry because I see people here stuck in this community, which I think is a prison, and they are stuck here and they do not know what to do." Bob Aylward is the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development and he is in Confederation Building to speak with me now. Mr. Aylward, there has been a lot of money spent on housing repairs. There is now a plan to implement a counselling service, but what do people really do to improve their house in a community like Davis Inlet unless they have a proper water and sewer system?

"The recommendations from the band council, particularly in Davis Inlet, they have been -- other than water and sewer -- we are negotiating a new agreement with the federal government and there will be more money forthcoming and we would hope that eventually the water and sewer and whatever needs there are in the community will be satisfied."

Are you saying then, that it is because the native people themselves have not placed a priority on water and sewer that it is not there now?

"I guess they had other priorities, or other more important problems. The housing problem, to my mind, a place to live would be a very high priority in any community. So, I guess they

Paradis, sub.

placed their priority on the housing particularly. I think there has been something like $2.3 million since the last 10 years spent on housing."

Does all the money come out of the same pot? I mean, have they got to choose between a house and a water and sewer system?

"They have some problems in Davis Inlet and many communities in Newfoundland have the same problem, without water and sewer and maybe not very good housing, but I guess the money in the kitty is all there is there now. There is never enough to do everything at the one time, so we just have to continue to try and improve."

Very briefly, when can they get their water and sewer system? When do you think it will happen?

"I have no idea what the actual date would be for commitment for water and sewer. That recommendation will come from the committee."

All right, Mr. Aylward, thank you very much.

Back in Davis Inlet, you do not have to look far to find out why there is a problem. The open ditches are incubators for disease. Fifteen people live in this leaky bungalow. The man in the middle is David Nook; the woman on the right is his aunt, Marie Shenuyie. If there is call for hope in the Innu situation, it rests with people like them.

Paradis, sub.

David Nook is just one of a new generation of Innu leaders: Articulate, angry, smart. They are urging their people to regain their independence. "The government wants us to change our lives to include in your society. You know, we cannot adapt to your society that fast and I do not think the Innu people will ever adapt to white society. Like, for example, you cannot adapt our society and our way of life, because it is too hard for you. Whereas, the government is trying to force us into modern areas and these things, like communities. So, I think that the government is pushing us into your society very much."

Wherever the Innu turn the white man is there. The latest intrusion: West German jets practicing low level flying. To the Innu, low level flying is a health issue. "My father and mother were in a canoe. The jet came down over them very low, so low they almost tipped over. My friend was in the canoe. He has a heart problem. When he saw the plane, he lost his breath. I believe they are trying to frighten us on purpose."

"The government does not care about our land. That is why he is destroying it. Down at the dam where I fish the fish is bad. If we eat it, we get sick. How many animals are getting sick like the fish? If we do not stop what they are doing, we will be in a bad way."

Many depend on game for half their

Paradis, sub.

yearly food supply. They claim the jets are scaring off the animals. Mary Jean Nouie remembers the way it was. As a girl, she grew up in the bush. Today she and her sister are baking bread, Innu style. The dough is laid down directly on the sand; no need for metal pans or expensive ovens; just cover it up, light a fire on top, and bake. Mary Jean believes her people could go back to this lifestyle and she constantly hopes they will.

There have been improvements at the government store in Davis Inlet, but getting fresh food is a problem. So, the diet that was once wildgame is now largely starch and it is expensive. Eggs, $3.09 a dozen, and often many items just are not available. Although the kids might have time to watch TV, Mary Jean does not. Whether it is cooking or cleaning, every drop of water has to be hauled.

The children are the most obvious victims. Nurse, Celina Kahn, blames the housing for turning minor problems into big ones. "Recurrent chest infections, recurrent ear infections, and probably skin conditions, that is very infectious. I mean it goes right around the house. You know, if one kid has it, you can be sure that the other five in the house have it."

At the Palasa Retreat the rule is strictly no alcohol and with a few exceptions the

9

Paradis, sub.

ban is obeyed. Six years ago Mary Jean's son was killed in a drunken brawl. Tonight she is making a wedding dress for her daughter, Elizabeth. Mary Jean says alcoholism is the Innu's biggest problem; not because her son died but because people who drink neglect themselves and their children. She said alcoholism is why the community does not work. The Innu have formed a health council and a drug and alcohol foundation. Young Innu activists, like Greg Pinoschuai, claim things are turning around. "There were a lot of people really outspoken at that meeting saying that they are totally against the medic training and even the health part of it as well, and how they see. You know, at the meeting there were people who are not like that, even their elders, who participated at the meeting."

David Nook agrees. He wonders, though, about the younger people. "I think the younger generation are keeping inside the white society now because the accumulation they get in schools and the domination they get in schools and this. That is one of the reasons but then it is not too late to get these kids out of there."

In fact, the gathering is designed to show the younger Innu the way of life they have only heard about is a better alternative. Here there is little of the squalor of Davis Inlet. If a floor gets dirty, you just put down a new one.

Paradis, sub.

Arctic char, salmon and caribou make up the daily menu.

Why has not the Innu health problem been solved? Its dimensions are well documented. Its causes are obvious and so are some of the solutions: A decent water supply for Davis Inlet, for example. For short term solutions, they will still have to depend on white man's government. The Innu decide on a traditional white man's solution. They will petition their Member of the House of Assembly. The prayer of that petition is to stop low level flying.

The Canadian Forces base in Goose Bay, Labrador -- this is a German Phantom RF-4E reconnaissance aircraft. The pilot will spend the day in the Labrador interior, learning to fly as low to the ground as possible. "We are flying down to 100 feet in the area, in the low level flying area, and we do mainly because we have to train to underfly the enemy radar."

The Department of National Defence allows the Germans and the British to train in central and southern Labrador in an area larger than the Province of New Brunswick. They are here because the terrain resembles eastern Europe. "Why are you flying over people?" "No, we are not. We are not allowed to." (Colonel David): "Yes, there are some people that the low level flights will be flying over, but ..."

Paradis, sub.

Lieutenant-Colonel John David runs this base and he says the policy of the Defence Department is to stay away from the Innu camps, but "even with the best navigation equipment you make mistakes."

The Innu people say the mistakes sometimes amount to several flights a day directly over their camps and they do not like it. The scientists do not yet know if the flights are affecting wildlife, but if they are, the effects on these people could be disastrous.

Innu leaders worry that if the flights continue people might stop going to the bush, then they will be stuck in this village year round. They also worry about the military's plans to start dropping practice bombs. The bombs will not contain explosives but the target sites will be off limits to Innu people. Meanwhile, the provincial government is encouraging military expansion in Labrador, saying there is no evidence that low level flying is harmful. Mayor Hank Shouse is convinced no harm will come from low level flying, although he admits he has not seen any environmental studies done from there. Mr. Shouse, you know, we get the feeling listening to the debates that goes on in Labrador, that no matter what the native people said about it, their concerns are sometimes not taken seriously, that they are dismissed.

Paradis, sub.

(Mayor Shouse): "Maybe that is partially due to the fact that everything that comes up, they seem to be against.

Do you take the concerns of the native people seriously, yourself? Do you think they have got a point at all?

(Mayor Shouse): "I think they have a point in that they do not want airplanes coming around harrassing animals.

Are you and the members of your Town Council concerned that opposition by the native people might inhibit the expansion of Goose Bay, might in some way prevent it from happening?

(Mayor Shouse): "Well, we are certainly concerned about it. We are also concerned about keeping the hundreds of jobs we currently have at the airport. We are concerned about the possibility of getting more. We do not want to lose the possibility of more. It is just like an industry; it is just like a fish plant."

All right, Mr. Shouse, thanks for speaking to me today.

There were Innu people from Labrador and northern Quebec, church workers, peace groups. They set up camp just outside Sheshatshit, Labrador, to talk about low level military flight testing. At the conference Innu people spoke of the deafening noise the planes made, how it frightens the women and children. They say the animals are getting scarce.

Paradis, sub.

The military says the planes will not harm the Innu. (Lieutenant-Colonel David) "They can go and fish and hunt wherever they want anytime of the day or night, anywhere, wherever they have gone. The only thing to make that a nice quiet area in that part is to tell us where they are going."

But, the Innu do not want to do that. It is their land, they say, and they should not have to report to the military. ... "It is colonialism ... so that we can fulfill as a people for ourselves, the structures we want for our children and for our society and for our race. You have moulded and structured things for us which you think are a big favour for us. You give us welfare. That is where you take the very soul out of us. We do not feed our children. Someone else is feeding them. We do not have that self respect that you people have. You are making money because you are lucky and you are working and you are making money from the stolen land of our people."

"The lake where he was at the military kept flying over this lake and they would go down low on this lake and at the end of the lake they would go up. Now, when they went up the hot exhaust would make the bows of the trees look like they were burned."

"Talking about the disturbance of the

Paradis, sub.

hunting and the level of the flights, which was started up at 200 feet, but now he says if you were on a valley, on one of the hills in the valley, if they were flying in a valley, you would look down on those planes."

(Ben Michel): "It is most certainly an invasion of our homeland. It is colonialism, that the people are fighting against."

If the Innu feel they have been invaded now, they will feel even worse if the Canadian Government has its way. Canada is asking NATO to set up a flight weapons training centre in Goose Bay. There is even a promotional film to sell the idea. The centre would bring more low level flights, air-to-ground weapons training, target practice, although with non-explosive bombs.

(Lieutenant Colonel David): "I would say there would be no impact on people or wildlife as a result of these training areas, none whatsoever."

It would mean expansion of the base and a boost for the economy of Goose Bay. So, people in Goose Bay want it. "It would be an increase for the businessmen, for our businesses, more jobs for people." (Ben Michel): "I am not willing to pay a price for my people-hood; for my nation-hood. We will continue to fight and we are only praying on the goodwill of our fellow human beings to help us here."

Paradis, sub.

The Innu are hoping this conference will inspire Canadians to pressure the federal government, so that it will no longer allow low level flights here and withdraw itself from Goose Bay for NATO flight testing and weapons training. "We are talking hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars, and I should point out that this Project will go ahead either in Turkey, or, perhaps, in Canada and it will be international money that will be spent."

Today, the Province responded. Three government ministers, responsible for wildlife, the environment and northern affairs, said native concerns about low level flying are not supported by the facts, but equally firm is the government's position that Labrador should be promoted for even more military activity. "If the West German training operation is added to by the operations of the other NATO Allies, the possibility exists that Goose Bay's economy, which has been stagnant since the American withdrawal in 1976, will again be revived, and this is an opportunity which the province cannot afford to lose."

It is clear that government favours more; not less, low level flying in Labrador. Native leaders say low level flying is part of operation "Deep Strike". (Ben Michel): "The Deep Strike training in Quebec and Labrador moves the US and its NATO Allies towards a more aggressive, lucrative

Paradis, sub.

stance."

Native groups say a native base at Goose Bay would be vulnerable to nuclear weapons, that the East Bloc countries can direct their weapons back this way and that will increase the chance of nuclear war, they say, and on that basis Canada should reject low level flying.

Canada has accepted low level flying with open arms and it would like even more that promoted Goose Bay as a site for a NATO base. The tons of jobs that will come with that project as brought the Newfoundland Government and several groups in Labrador onside. That is what the Innu are fighting. (Ben Michel): "Who gave you the right to give our land, our country to somebody else, and who gave you the right to be the owners of our land? We are a people. We have rights."

FATHER PARADIS: I will not speak too long. I think the film is pretty self-explanatory. Like I said initially, I represent a group of people who have been involved with the indigenous people of this country since their first arrival in Canada in 1843. I am referring to the Oblate Fathers of Mary Emmaculate. We have been involved with the Montagnais and the Naskapi people. Missionaries, like Father Labelle and Arnaud, were involved with the Naskapi and the Montagnais people since the end of the last century.

Paradis, sub.

This work with the indigenous people in this country: The Montagnais and Naskapi, have in many ways brought us a quite a bit of criticism the last number of years and a lot of the criticism has come from ourselves. In this film, I think it rightly places us with many of the other institutions and people such as those involved in the fur trade and the government and what-not, and we have come to realize, I think, some of the mistakes that we have made.

I think one of the mistakes we realize is that we have failed in the past in many ways to listen and to dialogue with the Innu people. In many cases we have come with our own pre-conceived ideas about what it means to survive in this country.

This form of culturization is assimulation and has in many ways brought very detrimental effects to the Innu people of Labrador. I think the film has shown the effects of this kind of approach, where, in many ways, we have thought that in order for them to survive they had to become like us.

Many of the situations, I think especially of the people of Davis Inlet, who, when they first settled began to settle on the coast in the turn of the century. Starvation was much of the reason why they ended up spending much more time on the coast. Still, there are people in Davis Inlet, th

Paradis, sub.

old people, who remember what it was to see people starving, seeing people hungry.

Now, there are many reasons why this has been the case, and I am sure many of us are aware of them, but in many ways the Innu people were forced, and it was not their choice, and the option was not presented to them, that they have to settle, they had to become more sedentary.

We have been in many ways promoting education, promoting health care, which in themselves were good things, but they represent a whole package, a complete package, which, in many ways, represented colonialization. I think we today are much more sensitive and aware of many of the things we did that were wrong. We try not to make these mistakes again. There are certainly many people and missionaries who have dedicated their lives. There must be a reciprocal relationship in terms of meeting the needs of the people.

I think of myself. I spent seven years in Davis Inlet and Sheshatshit and I came with many of the ideas and the motto that I was familiar with, many times not being able to listen or not understanding the Innu point of view, that they come from a different value system. That there is value in their traditional way of life and that it is a way of life which is okay. It is different from ours. The values are different but that is okay.

Paradis, sub.

This is what they know and quite obviously this is what many of the people in Sheshatshit and Davis Inlet -- the people have certainly become aware of the worst of what it means to be acculturated or assimulated. I remember talking to some of the elderly people in the communities when they spoke about what their experience was of the Goose Bay air base coming to the area, or the linerboard, and what they were saying was that they had nothing to benefit from it. That was their experience. The jobs they got were only what they referred to as "shovel" jobs, labourer jobs, that economically and industrially they gained nothing from this, only increased problems.

The Innu people of today certainly realize they are in the process of trying to rediscover what they are about, trying to rediscover a way of life which is okay for today; not a way of life which existed a hundred years ago because they realize that there are many changes of which they have no control over.

One of the big changes which is affecting them today is the low level flying. I myself was in the country once for six weeks in the spring of 1982. I was 100 miles into the interior from Davis Inlet, and one day when I was hunting suddenly a great boom of a noise hit me. It never dawned on me at the time that this was the planes. I thought myself I must have been in a war.

Paradis, sub.

This happened to us five times in this six-week period that these planes flew over us.

I could imagine the psychological effect that this would have on the Innu people who go into the country to live a traditional way of life, a way of life that they know, a way of life that they are comfortable with, and a way of life for many of them which is their livelihood, which gives them purpose, which gives them an identity.

I would say that the low level flying, the recommendations for a NATO base, can only bring detrimental effects to the Innu people. The experience of industrialization in the past has not been good and I see no reason why it should be any different. On the other hand, also it has not brought any good to the morals of the community.

One of the constant battles that we had was with the German soldiers who were in Goose Bay. I myself several times went to them and asked them to leave the community when they were in their van driving around the community trying to pick up some of the young girls. Quite often the mothers came to me asking me if I could do anything about this, that they were taking their daughters to the barracks for the weekend. I wrote to the Commander, asked him to do something about it, and things had changed for a little while but the change was short lived, and today we have several blond-haired

Paradis, sub.

children in the community as a result of these weekends.

So, I would say that -- my last comment is just that the Innu people have a valid way of life. To them it is valid, it is meaningful, and we have no right to impose something on them which would certainly change their way of life. It would make it very difficult for them to live as they traditionally had in the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Father Paradis. If you would be so kind to wait a moment while I ask if anvone would care to pose a question for clarification or to make a comment about your presentation. In that case, thank you very much again, sir.

MR. HICKEY: Just a last comment I would just like to address to the Father, if I may. My name is John Hickey. I live in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. On the last point you made in closing, you mentioned about the girls in Sheshatshit that were picked up by the German Air Force. Living, of course, in Goose Bay we know the news as to the rape statistics and that. Are you suggesting that the girls from Sheshatshit were brought from the community without -- what are you suggesting?

FATHER PARADIS: I am not suggesting anything. I am just stating that they were brought, as far as I can understand, talking to the girls as well, they were lured to the community by alcohol, for one thing, by good looking men, by money. I did not mention rape.

MR. HICKEY: I would suggest to you, Father, that having lived in a military community, the community of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and I am sure Northwest River, and any community that has such a base -- I lived in Churchill Falls during most of my life during the heavy construction days of the development of Churchill Falls, and those are normal things which happen in society. I am sure the same thing happens in Ottawa, and I was just wondering what point you were making.

FATHER PARADIS: I am not sure how normal they are, but I know they happen and they do not have a good effect on the people who are involved or the community at large.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments or questions?

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DAVID: I just would like to ask the Father, are the vehicles or the military still driving to Sheshatshit and going around and trying to pick up girls? Is that still happening?

FATHER PARADIS: I have been out of the community for two years, so I do not know.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DAVID: The other thing is that we have done a research into some of these allegations about fatherless children, because it has been brought up before. There have been allegations and we have been unable to get substantiated evidence that is in fact -- whether it is the military or whether it was white population or whether it was other people in the area. But, I would like to assure you that today there is a considerable concern to ensure that this does not happen, to ensure the people who may have been going there in the early days out of curiosity for one thing, to see the Indian village, that this is not the case today to the extent that you have indicated here.

It has not been brought to my attention specifically but there are many things that are happening in the community where there is the opportunity for mixing socially, whether it be in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, or whether it be through native people or any people coming to the hospital at the base, which is a common hospital, and having meetings.

I can assure you that the current administration, both from the military side and from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police side, are making certain that the type of thing that you have made allegations of here today does not happen today and in the future. It is not possible to keep men and women separate from each other no matter how hard you try unless you have bars or gates or fences up, but we are attempting, and, I think, through a very good social dialogue with the people responsible for that, and including the ministerial in the area, to ensure that this does not happen in a manner in which you have described it. So, I hope you can rest assured that we are making those efforts and that is not the case.

The one other thing that I would like to mention, since this is the last time, to the Panel, I would like to say to the Panel that from the hearings I have heard here, some of the presentations today, that there is really a great misunderstanding of the flying operation, as to how we are going about it, and what our capabilities are. This film clip here tonight with the many different interviews and perhaps the possibility of taking some of the information out of context, particularly some of the interviews with Catherine Wright, some of the questions that were asked and how they came out on the TV -- the same question, for example, in one case, and I would be prepared to brief in detail if you would like some more information on that -- but there was one case where the same question was asked to me over a 45-minute interview 12 times so that I would come out and say, "yes", because they were specifically trying to get a particular picture.

I do not need that, nor do the

people of Sheshatshit need that, nor anybody else, and so I would hope that with this information we will be able to go forward and that your new Guidelines and that your draft changes will be a help to all of us, including the Oblate Fathers who share a great responsibility in trying to bring forward the Innu through their transition period. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would anyone else care to make a comment? Yes, please go ahead.

LILIANNE COTNOIR: Là, c'est peut-être pour défendre un peu la position des femmes. Je pense que quand il y a une quantité si grande d'hommes dans une région, ça pose sûrement des problèmes de pornographie... de.. pas de pornographie mais de... voyons... de prostitution. Et puis c'est un problème qui est très important.

Connaissant la nature des hommes, il est certain qu'à un moment donné des femmes vont être sollicitées, quels que soient les moyens utilisés, je crois que c'est un problème qu'il faut mettre sur la table et qu'il faut étudier davantage. Et puis, même, ça peut faire partie des choses à évaluer plus tard dans le projet et puis même à imposer des sanctions, si jamais ça arrivait.

Mais il ne faut surtout pas prendre ce problème-là à la légère, parce que quelles que soient les bonnes intentions de l'administration, il n'est pas dit que les hommes sur le terrain ne trouveront pas les moyens d'arriver à assouvir leurs besoins.

r. .6

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, please identify yourself for the record.

MR. McGRAW: John McGraw. I am from Happy Valley-Goose Bay. I work for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador there. I am not speaking in that capacity and it is just sort of an observation that might be of interest to the people here and to the Panel, having to do with the situation with the Germans.

A little while ago on the Journal, or, I think it was a lunchtime show, they had a report about Shilo, Manitoba, where they have quite a few more German people there who come in to train and they have a lot more Indian people there too. It might be of interest for you to view that film. One of the reasons we have seen of the interest of the German lads specifically in the Indian girl, as aside from some of the other girls in town, has to do with an author by the name of Karl Mye, who about a hundred years ago in Germany published very many books about Canada and about the Indian people in Canada and the way they lived here. In English it would be sort of like Zane Grey or some of these western authors, and it became very popular in Germany. And, the German boys come over here; they see the Indian girls as exotics. They have, say, a particular interest in this because of this historical background.

It does not happen to all, I guess, that come over. In my own case, on a personal note, I had the misfortune that my daughter got mixed up with the British and I see Mr. Wilkinson laughing -- I ended up with a RAF guy living in my basement and no grandchildren yet but, perhaps, the gestation period for Englishmen is longer than it is for the rest of us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir. Does anyone else have a comment to make at this time? Yes, please, come forward.

MS. RUDKOWSKI: I am Claris Rudkowski. I just want to make a comment. I think no matter what type of development we look at, it is going to bring new people to the area and I think to some degree we will expect to see some of this happening, and I think, surely, for all of us who are presuming to be responsible individuals, this is a negative impact that we should be looking at and trying to minimize.

But, surely to goodness, we should not be banning a development simply because of a negative in regards to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for that comment. Well, if there are no other comments on that particular presentation, I would again thank Father Paradis.

Now, we have no other scheduled speakers for this evening but there is some time left before our scheduled closing of the session.

If there is any person or a representative of any group that has not appeared before this Panel already in this series of meetings, I would once again extend the invitation to such persons to come forward and make comment pertinent to the subject, ask a question of the Panel or of the representatives of the Department of National Defence. We have the time available and we are quite willing to stay here until the advertised closing time of this session.

Yes, sir, would you care to say something?

MR. BART JACK:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, basically what I want to say is I want to thank the Committee for allowing us to show the video tape and also I would like to thank the Committee for being in Labrador. I think you have a tremendous responsibility ahead of you, and I think it will not be easy. We are confronted here by both levels of government. On the one hand we have the provincial government; on the other hand we have the federal government. In all of this we have the federal government supporting a group, the pro-military. So, ahead of you you have a very tremendous responsibility.

I would like to thank each and everyone of you for being in our community; being so gracious and spending so much time with us. I think you have looked at especially our angle in a delicate manner, as it is, very straightforwardedly.

Maybe I should say also, that when the environmental process takes place next fall, I think several groups have alluded to the fact that we would like you to look at the possibility, although it is not in your mandate, to halt low level flying. I do not want to reiterate that because I think other groups have done that, but just to say that I think we will co-operate in every way we can ourselves, the Innu, and we will present you the facts as we see them. Now, some of the facts we have presented have been gathered at our expense and have been supported by other groups, including the churches and so forth. We will continue to look for that support elsewhere, because we believe that there is a conscience mind in Canada, and I believe that we are going to get it.

Basically, I want to say is that I want to thank each and every one of you, as I said before, for being patient to listen to us, and to go to almost all of our communities -- you have attended most of the communities, big Innu communities -- and I hope that next fall when we begin to sit again we will probably have a better understanding of our situation and that we will work ourselves, vigilantly, with this issue to present you with all the facts that we believe are important.

So, we would like to thank you, David and I, who have come from a long way to attend this

PM-80

meeting, again supported by church groups and so forth. We would like to thank you and we would like to extend an invitation once again in the fall to our communities where you will probably share once again the lifestyle which you shared with us that afternoon and morning of last month, and hopefully we will have a better communication, better understanding of each other. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Jack, for those kind words, and we appreciate your offer to co-operate in this review and certainly hope that we will receive co-operation too from all the other parties that have indicated their interest in this.

I just remembered that there was a comment made a little earlier this evening about the fact that there is no woman on this Panel, which, of course, is quite true. Unfortunately, the one lady who was appointed to this Panel last July found it necessary to resign for professional reasons. I am given to understand that we are getting quite close to having another person appointed as the seventh member of this Panel, and I believe there will be an announcement to that effect in the near future.

Would anyone else care to say anything? If not, then I would like to thank you all for coming here today and to thank especially those who have come forward and made presentations to the Panel. We are now going to get busy at the task of refining the Guidelines into their final form, and, as we said earlier, our hope is to deliver the final Guidelines to National Defence sometime in the month of December and let them proceed then with the task of researching and preparing the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are not going to sit back and do nothing during all that time. There will be announcements and information bulletins issued by the Panel from time to time and you can look forward to seeing some sort of information report from the Panel, I would think, sometime early in the new year.

Finally, after thanking you, I would like to thank the other members of the Panel; I would like to thank the members of the Secretariat for helping to arrange this meeting and for handling other very important tasks. Thanks also to our interpreters, who have worked very hard for us in the booth at the back room. Thank you to our Court Reporters and to our Audio Technician. Good night.

---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 9:00 P.M.